

This generation was one of the first to read the books of Bianchi, Bazhov, Kassil, Fraerman, Gai Dar, Zhitkov ... It was for him that

the brilliant masters of books worked  
graphic graphics Lebedev, Safonova, Konashevich...

Academicians Obruchev and Fersman wrote for them.

It was their still unintelligent, but malleable mind that listened to the reports of Chkalov, Gromov, Papanin, Kokkinaki. It was they

who caught the sparkle with burning eyes  
the first Stars of the Heroes of the Union and Heroes of Labor.

No, the freedom of behavior of these thirty-year-olds in the sixties is not the result of the rotten Khrushchev "thaw", but the result of Stalin's Russians  
the cold of the thirties, which froze not clean and hardened the young soul for an intelligent, active  
life.

"The Russian cold is good for my health," this is Pushkin. Therefore,

one should not be surprised that in 1937, a cold year for Russia's enemies, the country celebrated the centenary of Pushkin's anniversary as a state event. It was the centenary of not the birth, but the death of the poet, but it was the anniversary of his new revival in Russia and coming to that mass reader, about whom he wrote in the "Monument" ...

No, everything healthy in the young "sixties" is from the era of the Bolshevik Stalin. And having nailed  
Later, the souls of many of them are rotten - from the middle years of the smart careerist and unrevealed Trotskyist Khrushchev, who today, too, is read by some as the first figure in Russian history.

I leaf through a tattered book... N. Verzilin.

"Following Robinson's footsteps", Leningrad branch of Detgiz, second edition, corrected and supplemented, 1953. Year of Stalin's death...

By this year, the attitude of the new person has already been formed. In October 1920, at the Third Congress of the Komsomol, Lenin only dreamed: "You can become a communist only when you enrich your memory with the knowledge of all those riches that you worked for mankind." By 1953, thirty-three years had passed since then. And Verzilin's book from the "School Library" series visibly and convincingly proved that Lenin's words had turned from a program into a fact of everyday practice.

New people have grown up, free from poverty of spirit... People who have so enriched their minds with knowledge of the spiritual and scientific riches of mankind that they were already able to write new books *for* those who can become even freer, even more intellectually, spiritually and physically developed than their predecessors.

Just, it would seem, a book about the history of cultivated plants and useful wild plants. However, the characters of Jules Verne and Defoe, Twain and Cooper, Mine Reed and Arseniev naturally coexist on its pages...

Longfellow's poems about the Hiawatha Indian and Maikov's, Ivan Surikov's, Vsevolod Rozhdestvensky's, Pyotr Komarov's poems about Russian nature...

Quotes from Saadi and Miklouho-Maclay, stories about the mummies of Ancient Egypt and the wars of the Scarlet and White Roses, about the adventures of the Soviet pilot Marina Raskova...

The history of tea, coffee, paints, paper ...

And advice on how to make this paper, these paints in the course of the Russian forest, how to make a fire, bake cakes and find the right path in the thicket.

Prisoner of Shlisselburg Narodnaya Volya Novorussky, naturalists Burbank and Michurin, brave captains de Clieu and Cartier, academicians Pyotr Pallas, Timiryazev and Obruchev, legionnaires of Ancient Rome

ma, Lotus-eaters of Ancient Greece, Sadko and Vasily Buslaev...

Hundreds of names, dates, situations! And all this does not fall apart, but lives a single life united in the creativity, search and labor of mankind. A

modest book... And

at the same time - a majestic result of the era of Stalin. One of its logical results, turned forward, into the intelligent being of a Man - a friend and master of the Planet...

However, in the early thirties, this was still far away. Actually, at that time the very possibility of such a future in the USSR was still in question. It is questionable both because the real work in the country was just beginning, and because there were many who wanted to curse it and disrupt it. In September 1930,

Stalin wrote to Molotov:

"Vyacheslav! Take away, for God's sake, the seal from her mouse squeal about "solid breakthroughs", "endless failures", "breakdowns", etc. bullshit. This is a hysterical Trotskyist right-wing deviationist tone that is not justified by the data and does not suit the Bolsheviks. Economic Life, Pravda, For Industrialization, and partly Izvestia are behaving especially shrilly...

Bye then. Shake your hand.

*I. Stalin.*

Yes, you won't be jealous! On the one hand, there are former princes who behind your back consider you a "sadist". On the other hand, yesterday's comrades-in-arms, party comrades, honoring the "adventurer" ... At the end of the twenties, in the thick textbook of Berdnikov and Svetlov

according to political literacy, "the impossibility of building socialism in one country" was also proved.

Five years have passed, and the "failed" - in the eyes of the princes Golitsyn - "sadist" still writes to the same Molotov:

"Hello, Vyacheslav! 1) The letter was received by Chil. We are thinking of organizing cadet schools for artillery, aviation and the navy. 2) I am sending a directive to the Council of People's Commissars and the Central Committee on compiling control figures for the year 36. In the event that the cost of capital works is reduced by 8 % , which is a mandatory directive, capital works will be increased to 27 billion if the state issues 25 billion. This creates an incentive to reduce cost.

An increase in school construction (+760 million), in light industry, timber, food, industry and local industry (more than 900 million in total), in defense - (+1 billion 100 million), in health care, moskanalstroy and other items (more 400 million rubles) determined the physiognomy and size of the target figures for the year 36. I have no regrets, because everything that multiplies the production of consumer goods must be strengthened from year to year. Without this, there is no way to move forward now. Well hello!

*I. Stalin.*

On October 1, 1935, the rationing system for meat and fish products, for sugar,

fats and potatoes. And from January 1, 1936 - on pro mental goods. In

December 1931, when Stalin talked with the German writer Emil Ludwig, there were cards, but not as a principle, but as a necessity.

As for principles, Stalin told Ludwig:

"Legalization has nothing to do with Marxist socialism. Only people who are not familiar with Marxism can imagine things so primitively, as if the Russian Bolsheviks want to gather all the benefits together and then divide them equally.

Such

socialism under which all people would receive the same pay, the same amount of meat and bread, would wear the same costumes—Marxism knows no such socialism. It is perfectly clear that different people have and will have different needs under socialism. Socialism has never denied the difference in tastes, in the quantity and quality of needs.

And it was not only a principle. For example, Stalin's socialism did not impose uniformity of tastes so intrusively and impudently as capitalist advertising does today, from which even those who cannot imagine life without capitalism, which is impossible without impudent, intrusive and deceitful advertising, sometimes get tired of it.

Actually, Stalin's socialism did not impose any tastes on anyone at all. He *developed* a taste for sports, for real art, for a truly healthy life filled with smart work ...

I ALREADY DISCUSSED the theme of the repressions of 1937-1938, and now I will return to it in a different setting, reminding the reader that the period from the second half of the thirties to the end of the thirties turned out to be a period when the new Russia became a fact and from year to year gained power and influence, but when old Russia was still strong and influential inside the country - old in the broad sense of the word, which by the second half of the thirties contained everything obsolete, from the "former" who did not accept the new life to those who disagreed with it or simply decomposed old party members.

As a kind of "screen saver" to the presentation below, I will cite the story of the company commander behind the pass A.F. Andreeva from the village of Zdorovets, Livensky district, Central Black Earth region.

In the winter of 1931, he wrote a statement addressed to the Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) comrade. Sta  
line, starting it like this:

"On October 1, 1918, I voluntarily entered the service in the Red Army, where I remained until 1923. All this time he was at the fronts, occupying command posts

up to the commander of the regiment, inclusive,  
injured..."

Returning home to the village, Andreev became an asset nym selkor, and his intransigence stood up to many bureaucrats as a bone across the throat. In 1930, he was "cleaned out" from the collective farm and they wanted to deprive him of his voting rights, moreover, Andreev reported that "the White Guard officer Kozhukhov Ivan Ivanovich was in the election commission at that time." And then Andreev was arrested in general and put behind bars. Describing their ordeals, the commanders of the reserve

chival:

"... All statements are hushed up, and the prosecutor even warned me not to disturb me with my statements. I led companies, battalions and regiments into battle with the White Guards, not in order to now be under arrest through these same White Guards ... Addressing you, comrade. Stalin, I ask you to pay attention to my statement and provide assistance to get out of this situation. Revolutionary legitimacy must prevail, the perpetrators of my wanton arrest must be punished. Material on me is in the Livny GPU - all by me

I confirm the above documentary with the data that I have."

On this statement, Stalin wrote: "*Comrade. Yagoda.*

*Please, immediately move one of your people (completely reliable) and in the Bolshevik way -*

*honestly, quickly and impartially sort out the case and "regardless of faces".*

2.II-31. Stalin." As you can see, a simple person, already

sitting in a cell of the provincial department of the OGPU, could unrestrictedly, not in a humiliated tone of a petitioner, but as an equal, turn to Stalin and achieve justice.

And this principle was strictly observed all the following years. But when the large-scale repressions of 1937/38 began, for some reason Stalin's desk was not littered with letters like Andreevsky's. Although they wrote "upstairs" not without success even then ... An indicative, but far from the only, example here is the future Marshal Rokossovsky.

Isn't it because in those years a stream of letters did not pour into the Kremlin because the majority of the repressed *knew* the real guilt behind them, and not the guilt "knocked out" in the NKVD? Now, however, one has to read in publications

"democrats" that letters went in hundreds of thousands, but "did not reach" Stalin. For all that, in the "democratic" publications of documents, for some reason, to this day, at least two or three such "unexamined" letters, "settled" in the "cellars of the NKVD", are not given. But this is so - a saying!

The story was like this...

In August 1936, the first

Moscow trial began in Moscow in the case of the "anti-Soviet terrorist center" of Zinoviev and Kamenev.

In January 1937, a trial took place in the case of "Pa parallel anti-Soviet Trotskyist center, where among the accused were Muralov, Pyatakov, Radek (the first two were sentenced to death, the third to imprisonment). The summer of 1937 saw the trial

of Tukhachevsky in the case of a military conspiracy in the Red Army, and in March 1938, the trial of Bukharin's "right-wing Trotskyite" bloc. At the same time, there was a serious purge in

the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

Ambassadors were summoned to Moscow and many were shot. At Bukharin's trial, Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs Krestin

sky...

The Comintern did not bypass the

repressions either. The reasons for the purges and repressions among the Soviet elite in the second half of the thirties do not fit into any one general scheme. Only a very unscrupulous or very ignorant person can consider them as something whole. And there is no explanation more distant from the true than to see behind them Stalin's struggle for

power.

Stalin really fought here, but not for

"armchair", but for the future of the country, for the power of the people.



As for the alleged "bloodthirstiness" of Stalin, this is how the fate of Bukharin and Rykov, who were arrested in February 1937 during the plenum of the Central Committee, was seen by the members of the Central Committee commission. It, formed under the chairmanship of Mikoyan, included thirty-six people, including all members of the Politburo, N.K. Krupskaya, M.I. Ulyanova, N.S. Khrushchev, S.M.

Budyonny ... So ... People's Commissar of Internal Affairs Yezhov: expel them from the party, bring them both to trial by the Military Tribunal and shoot them. He was supported - already after Stalin's speech, by the way

-  
Manuilsky, Kosarev, Shvernik and Yakir. Postyshev - to exclude and judge,

but - "without the use of execution." Stalin, who spoke fourth, suggested expelling both of them from the party, "not to bring the case to court, but to send the case to the NKVD." The remaining

members of the commission supported Stalin. I think it was no accident that Kosarev and Yakir, who were later arrested and shot, were really bloodthirsty. They would investigate the criminal (here the reader will have to take my word for it) activities of Bukharin and Rykov in the NKVD. Nothing.

And even a superficial analysis shows that in history, for example, the "Moscow trials" are intertwined with several heterogeneous phenomena at once, sometimes hostile to each other even on the same dock.

Tukhachevsky, Yakir,

Uborevich, Kork, Eideman, Feldman, Putna and Primakov were tried by the Special Judicial Presence of the Supreme Court of the USSR, headed by Ulrich, Chairman of the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court. Five of the seven members

Absences - Alksnis, Blucher, Belov, Dybenko, Kashirina  
- were also shot a year later. someone was

an adventurer, someone a Trotskyist, someone a vulgar  
"snickered", drank himself and was reborn, and someone died and  
innocently.

But the latter were in the minority. However,  
innocent is not unreasonable. slander  
political adventurers eliminated those who hindered the same adventurers,  
Trotskyists or...

Or - skillfully hiding its essence with direct  
enemies of the Soviet government...

This feature of the purges within the state security organs was even  
more pronounced. The primitive explanation of Trotsky, the Trotskyists  
and other opponents of Stalin - they remove, they say, inconvenient  
witnesses, did not take long. But that was not the point. And even not in the  
fact that Yezhov, in the process of purges, sharply reduced the percentage  
of Chekists-Jews. The KGB environment itself, as well as the political and  
military environment in general, was politically and psychologically  
multilayered .

Today they have become available, albeit in small circulation (from 1  
to 3 thousand copies) collections of documents.

cops, such data that leave no doubt in the picture of a number of broad  
not only anti-Stalin

Russian, but also, in the exact sense of the word, anti-state conspiracies  
that were formed for various reasons in the period from the end of the 20s  
to the second half of the 30s. Only in some collections of the International  
Fund "Democracy" from the series

"Lubyanka. Stalin", covering the period from 1922 to 1953, published  
a total of more than 1700 (thousand seven hundred) various documents,  
the study of which refutes the "democratic" insinuations against Stalin,  
including the accusation of sanctioning

mass use of torture and measures of physical influence in the OGPU-NKVD. Although the measures of physical coercion - as an exclusive means for obtaining information from those who did not confess for months and were clearly guilty - were allowed in 1937.

But this, as a rule, required special instructions... And, talking a lot about mass authorized "torture" in the NKVD,

Russian "historians" cite single specific documents on the authorization of measures of physical influence in relation to, for example, Unshlikht, Belov and a number of other high-ranking detainees. But then the situation was very acute - I had to be convinced of the betrayal of many seemingly reliable people. I do not intend to over-tire the reader of this - I hope, simple enough to

read and understand - book with numerous excerpts from archival papers, but I will give something.

Here, for example, is a statement dated April 13, 1939, by one of the former leaders of the OGPU and the NKVD of the times of Yagoda and Yezhov, Mikhail Frinovsky, a colorful and outstanding personality, addressed to Beria, People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR, which soon came to the table and to

Stalin. It starts like this:

### "STATEMENT

Investigators charged me with anti-Soviet conspiratorial work. For a long time the thought of the need to confess to my criminal activity during the period when I was at large struggled in me, but the miserable state of a coward got the better of me. Having the opportunity to tell you and the leaders of the party, of which I am not a member, about everything

I have been worthy in recent years, deceiving the Party - I did not do this. Only after my arrest, after the indictment was brought and after a personal conversation with you, did I embark on the path of repentance and I promise to tell the investigation the whole truth to the end, both about my criminal enemy work and about the persons who are accomplices and leaders of this criminal enemy work. I became a

criminal because of blind trust in the authorities of my leaders YAGODA, YEVDOKIMOV and EZHOV, and having become a criminal, together with them I did a vile counter-revolutionary deed against the party ... "

And then there are detailed, specific, not so much even testimonies, how many reminiscences describing various situations and conversations, mentioning many names... These "reminiscences", even in the printed version, take up more than 16 pages of the typographical format 70X100 1/16 . And at the end, Frinovsky promises to tell "with exhaustive completeness" much more of what he knows ...

You can't dictate such things and you won't beat them out with "tortures" ... Only a confused, very guilty person, but who has realized the senselessness of denials, who has fought a lot for the cause of the people, worked hard for the country, but from some moment overestimated his own and his like-minded people the opportunity to do without the leadership of Stalin, and take the "steering wheel" of the country

by ourselves...

Or here is the testimony of June 1, 1937 of the former Marshal of the Soviet Union Mikhail Tukhachevsky, section II "Plan of Defeat" ... The beginning is as follows:

"The Center for the Anti-Soviet Military Trotskyist

Conspiracy carefully studied materials and sources that could answer the question: what are Hitler's operational plans aimed at ensuring the domination of German fascism in Europe? .."

And then follows a detailed analysis, which is not capable of an NKVD investigator, but only one of the highest military leaders and staff officers, which Tukhachevsky was in the Red Army ... And this is also not pure testimony, but a military-political analysis, in the course of whom Tukhachevsky is fond of and begins to argue with his own "accomplices" and writes, for example:

"Uborevich points out that harm  
The evidence is intrusion operations,  
if they have a gap in time with the end of the concentration of  
the main forces. This is a wrong, erroneous conclusion...

As for Uborevich's instructions that he was developing a sabotage plan for capturing the Baranovichi fortified region by cavalry, supported only by weakly armed mechanized brigades, without any participation of infantry, then

this is just an example of how  
there was sabotage in operational terms,  
but does not in any way serve as proof of the  
harmfulness of invasion operations ... "

This military-strategic analysis occupies almost 14 pages of printed text in a book of typographic format b0x90 1/16 .

And here is the beginning of the

letter from the commander of the 1st rank, Iona Yakir, addressed to the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs Yezhov from

June 10, 1937 - on the eve of the meeting of the Special Judicial Presence of the Supreme Court of the USSR, which sentenced Yakir to death:

"If you consider it possible and necessary, I ask you to transfer it to the

Central Committee and NGOs. I said everything. It seems to me that I am again with my beloved country, with my native Red Army. It seems to me that I am again the honest, loyal fighter that I was about 17 years old, and therefore I dare to put a series of questions before you, a series of final thoughts and proposals..."

What is it - embossed?

After all, a person already has one foot psychologically in the grave. He sums up his life, because he knows that others are about to sum up his life. And you don't want to leave it completely messed up. I want to clean up a little.

This is the essence of Yakir's last letter. Next come - on 7 pages of printed text in a book of typographic format b0x90 1/16 - qualified, competent assessments of the shortcomings of the Red Army and proposals for their elimination, for the development of troops, which no one in the NKVD could dictate to Yakir, even if he tried very hard would ... At the same time, Yakir admits:

"It's not that everything is written, which would definitely be necessary. It turns out everything is wrong with me, not specifically, unorganized in this last note. It's hard to work, but I'm trying to keep going. You write, and the thought comes back all the time: how did you get

to the camp of enemies, how did you go against your country, how did you end up on the other side of the barricade..."

I think this is enough to understand - Yakir was guilty?

IF "democratic" *allegedly* documentary and accurate *documentary* data about those two or three years are entered into a supercomputer, then a consistent version of events will not be built. Well, how to reconcile, say, the fact that the Trotskyists accused Stalin of "conspiracy with Hitler", and at the Moscow trials the defendants were charged with cooperation with German intelligence? The heroes of the Civil War, awarded the Honorary Revolutionary Weapon, stood "against the wall",

and the former tsarist officers Shaposhnikov, Govorov, Karbyshev, Count Ignatiev, the former Guards Colonel nobleman Ardalyon Bobry

shchev lived, were healthy, bore the rank of generals of the Workers 'and Peasants' Red Army. Someone

will say: they cringed, that's why, they say, they survived. But they, firstly, were people of the wrong kind and behaved with restraint and dignity. And secondly, among the executed, there were enough of those who really glorified Stalin with all their strength as commanding lungs. Or here: Antonov-Ovseenko,

who arrested the Provisional Government, is being repressed, while the Socialist-Revolutionary Abram Gotz and the Menshevik Lev Deich quietly live out their lives in peace, like a number of former ministers of the Provisional Government who remained in the USSR.

Members of the first Soviet government are settling in prison bunks, and the former Menshevik and former Minister of Labor of the Samara Constituent Assembly, Ivan Maisky, is quietly working as a Soviet plenipotentiary.

in London. And no one calls him to Moscow for execution - as happened with many of his colleagues with an impeccable revolutionary pro  
slime.

Major General Eliseev in the twenties commanded the coastal defense of the naval forces of the Baltic Sea. A participant in the revolution, in 1937, already in the Pacific Fleet, he was slandered, arrested, and convicted. But two years later he was released, reinstated in the party and in rank, and appointed commander of the Hanko base. Moreover, the fate of at least hundreds of commanders of the Red Army and the Red Army was similar to his fate. The aircraft designer Tupolev was arrested (by the way, for the cause), and he and his

inner circle developed new aircraft designs within the walls of a closed design bureau subordinate to the NKVD. An explanation is being sought today in what Stalin believed: in an atmosphere of fear for their lives, engineers would work better.

But the aircraft designers Yakovlev, Ilyushin, Miko Yan, Tupolev's deputy Arkhangelsky did not fall into any Gulags. Arkhangelsky, just as he was Tupolev's deputy before the forced "landing" of the chief, so he remained after Tupolev's arrest. As for Soviet tanks, artillery,

small arms, then almost all of their const

The instructors, if they went to the camps, then to the military training camps - for field tests of their designs. I managed without the Gulag. Why? It would seem that politically tested

professional

intelligence officers from the Intelligence Directorate of the Red Army and diplomats from the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs became "defectors". And politically neutral Soviet engineers, scientists,

specialists left the USSR for business



and scientific business trips and came back to the USSR.  
What

was the difference?

From Soviet ports every day went for  
the border of the court with Soviet crews, and there was  
no mass flight from them in foreign ports

elk.

What is it?

Oddly enough, of all the existing versions of the events  
of 1937, **the most** consistent (though far from complete)  
is the official version. That is, this: the Trotskyist and anti-  
Stalinist opposition eventually degenerated into something  
directly hostile to the interests of socialism in the USSR,  
was exposed, and had to be burned with a red-hot iron.

In the expression "hot iron" the essence is expressed  
precisely. Such a potent remedy is resorted to when the  
body is affected by ulcers of mortal danger, and there is  
no time for therapy or fine surgery. The burning of ulcers  
is painful precisely because, along with the diseased cells,  
the healthy cells that are next to them are also burned .  
But there's nothing you can do about it: either burn it out  
and -

survive.

Or give up and die. However, the scale of  
the repressions of the "top" was not as significant as  
the Khrushchevites falsely claimed at the beginning and  
now the Yeltsinoids claim. Marshal Zhukov already in post-  
Stalin times about  
one day, he admitted stolidly that at *that* time, they say, he  
did not know how extensive the reprisals were  
these.

Well, Luxembourg, of course, is a great power, but for  
some reason, those who travel through it from France to  
Germany do not notice Luxembourg. So it is with  
repressions - for example, in the Red Army. Their scale was not

comprehensive and catastrophic, which is why Zhukov did not know about them **then** . And their character was such that, in the long term, they rather increased the command level in the troops and their combat effectiveness. The documents of 1937/38, now dissected and published by the "democrats" themselves, show a depressing picture of the state of the Red Army, to which the army was brought by the "brilliant" Tukhachevskys with yakirs, oboreviches and bluchers. The "Yeltsinoid" historian of the General Staff, General Yuri Gorkov, in his 1993 book The Kremlin.

Bid. The General Staff" states: "What Stalin and his henchmen did to the army is comparable only to a major military disaster."

But this is just nonsense! It would be a disaster to leave the Tukhachevskys in their command posts. Suffice it to say that Uborevich (chief of armaments of the Red Army in 1930/31) and Tukhachevsky (chief of armaments of the Red Army in 1931-1936) did not produce an excess of aging light tanks, but did not take care of radio communications for them, why did the Germans with their radio communications so easily and outplayed our tankers at the beginning of the war.

There were no walkie-talkies on the fighters ordered by Uborevich and Tukhachevsky, although Stalin gave instructions on their radio equipment back in the first half of the 30s. And after all, not only Uborevich, Tukhachevsky, Khalepsky,

Yakir were to blame for such a military-technical policy. Other commanders of a lower rank did not resist her either. And for some reason, almost all of them are from those who were shot in 1937-1938.

According to the charters developed by the "creative genius eat "of this general, in the first echelon of the division out of 17,000 (seventeen thousand) people, only 640 (six hundred and forty) people attacked. It's hard

believe, but this is data from the report of the Chief of the General Staff,  
General of the Army Kirill Me

Retskoy at a meeting of the top leadership of the Red Army on December  
23-31, 1940. Here's another example... Already after

the disclosure and liquidation of Tukhachevsky's conspiracy, from  
November 21 to 27, 1937, an expanded meeting of the Military Council under  
the People's Commissar of Defense of the USSR Voroshilov was held in  
Moscow. It considered the results of combat training for 1937, the tasks for  
1938 and the measures taken in the Red Army to clear its ranks from  
conspirators and pests. Among the speakers was the commander of the  
Transcaucasian military district, 44-year-old commander Nikolay Kuibyshev,  
the younger brother of Valerian Kuibyshev,

who had already died by that time. Nikolai Kuibyshev was appointed to  
the ZakVO in 1937, in the same year he was elected a deputy of the Supreme  
Soviet of the USSR. And so, at a meeting of the Military Council, he reported  
that the combat training of the troops of the district should be assessed as  
unsatisfactory and ... However, I'd rather give direct extracts from

transcripts of the meeting:

**"Kuibyshev. ...** The training of rifle troops  
and military headquarters is unsatisfactory

telna.

**Voroshilov. Why?**

**Kuibyshev.** I will tell you further, comrade  
to the native commissar, why such

results and how we live it.

**Voroshilov.** We live, we live. Now it 's too  
late to get over it. You had to get over this in the  
process of work (by that time Kuibyshev  
commanded the district for about six months. -  
S.K.).

**Kuibyshev.** ... The main reason that we have not outlived all these shortcomings is that our district was very deprived of roofing ...

***Voice from the spot.*** Where did the

commanders go ? **Kuibyshev.** ... transferred to the department of the NKVD without occupying certain positions ... "

Kuibyshev's caustic reply was hardly in the mind of the walls, as were his references to the fact that he had three divisions, including the Armenian one, commanded by captains, and the commander of the Armenian division had not even commanded a battalion before ... Even at the beginning June 1937, Kuibyshev was the head of the military group of the Party Control Committee of the Central Committee, took an active part in the meeting of the Military Council under the People's Commissar of Defense of the USSR on June 1-4, after the disclosure of Tukhachevsky's conspiracy, and with prejudice (the evidence is a transcript) interrogated some of those who was also arrested shortly after this meeting. So Kuibyshev, firstly, knew the situation, and secondly, if he wanted to, he could find in the cadres of the Red Army even more trained Armenians in a rank higher than "captain" ... For example, Lieutenant Colonel Bagramyan, who graduated in 1934 Year of the Military Academy. Frunze, in the period 1936-1938 - a student of the Academy of the General Staff, and in 1934-1936 - the chief of staff of the 5th cavalry division of the Kyiv military district, the future marshal ... We read the transcript below:

**Kuibyshev.** The second reason is eyewash. I am fully responsible for

I show that in the district eyewash existed as a system in all types of training. Checking the state of shooting training showed that the best people were selected. For artillery firing - the same commanders who shoot from year to year at observation firing ...

**Egorov.** It was always (!? - S.K.)  
ominous phenomenon.

**Kuibyshev.** The third reason is the extremely low demands of the command staff **of all degrees** (my emphasis. - S.K.) both to themselves and to their subordinates ... As a rule, in tactical classes, he defected ka conditional, conditional self-entrenching, conditional disguise...

(laughter). **Egorov.** Are they

conditionally fed too? **Kuibyshev.** The food is not conditional ...

Before Kuibyshev, ZakVO was commanded by Army Commander 2nd Rank Mikhail Lewandovsky. From June 1937, he was appointed commander of the Primorsky Group of OKDVA - the Special Red Banner Far Eastern Army, was arrested on February 23, 1938 and shot on July 29, 1938.

And he was shot, as we see, for the cause. The Khrushchevites rehabilitated him on April 28, 1956. But  
for what?

For the decomposition of  
the troops? As for Kuibyshev, it followed from his own words that the main reasons for the poor preparation of the ZakVO were not arrests, but many years of criminal neglect or deliberate sabotage.  
those who were arrested.

But that's not all! Let's take a closer look at Kuiba himself sheva. To begin with, let me tell you this ....

At the same meeting of the Military Council in November 1937, commander M.A. Antonyuk has been commander of the Siberian Military District since June 1937. He replaced the commander of the 2nd rank Dybenko, who in turn replaced the commander Gailit, who had commanded the Siberian Military District since December 1933. Let's go back to the transcript:

**"Antonyuk.** In the Siberian military district  
ge, as in other districts, enemies of the people,  
spies, wreckers, firmly put their hand to undermine the  
combat effectiveness of the troops. There is not a single  
branch of work, Comrade People's Commissar, where  
there is no sabotage. The deeper you dig, the more you  
find... <...> I believe that the units for conducting complex  
combined arms combat are  
not really trained, the interaction of military branches...  
about  
should remain at a low level. Weakly cohesive  
headquarters ...

The district completely lagged behind and did not  
conduct combat firing in the past ... Our commanders do not  
really conduct firing from half-closed, closed positions,  
machine-gun platoons, machine-gun batteries

they know

how ... Simplification in fire training is evident ... The  
command staff today is not  
mastered a truly small arms, especially a light machine gun,  
... unsatisfactorily shoots from a revolver vera TT ... "

I note that "TT", that is, "Tula Tokarev" -

it was a pistol, not a revolver, and it was shameful for Commander Antonyuk not to know this. But let's continue quoting, giving the floor to the member of the Military Council of the Siberian Military District, divisional commissar N.A. Jung:

**"Jung.** Counter-revolutionary activity ... in the troops of the Siberian Military District ... assumed very broad dimensions. 70 % of those dismissed from the army turned out to be enemies of the people, and they were immediately arrested (352 people were dismissed, of which 249 were arrested.

- S. K). <...>

Kolchakovtsev (that is, who served with Kolchak. - S. K.), Comrade People's Commissar, We have several hundred people in our cadres. We have approached them personally, but we must report to you that among them a significant number have been recruited by the enemy. It pops up every day...

Whatever area you take on, there is disgrace everywhere... Food stocks of NZ (untouchable stock. - S. K) are infected with granary pests... property is not stocked. For example... 80 pants, 100 boots, 50 overcoats...

... There are a lot of unrest in aviation ... the rear of the air brigades are in a ruined state ... Machines stand in the open for 3-4-5 years, rot, the material part deteriorates ... "

Antonyuk and Jung accused - and, of course, rightly - the former commander of the Gaili district

that. He was arrested on August 15, 1937 and shot on August 1, 1938. The Khrushchevites also rehabilitated him on November 28, 1956. But who was replaced in December 1933

by Commander Gailit ? Yes, that's just it, that he replaced the

commander N.V. Kuibyshev, who commanded the Siberian Military District from 1928 to 1933 (according to some sources, including the TSB, even until 1936, but this is unlikely). And if Gailit's predecessor had prepared the troops properly, then in less than four years the

Siberian military district would not have fallen into a deplorable state. After all, the fleets of air brigades began to rot even under Kuibyshev. And could Kuibyshev, at least after he became the first military figure in the CCP, ask how *my* old district lives there, which I commanded *for five years*? In addition, Kuibyshev could not help visiting Siberia from time to time on business trips. And one more thing ... If he, commanding the Siberian Military District, acquired there

reputation of a true "father-commander", then after all, someone from his old district could himself come to Moscow to the former commander - with his worries about the situation in the area.

However, Kuibyshev was also involved in plots for the talkers, and on February 2, 1938 he was arrested, and on August 1, 1938 he was shot. It's a pity, of course... But it's a

pity not because an innocent person died - Kuibyshev **was** guilty. It is a pity that the "red marshals", who emerged from the Civil War, did not understand that they had to prepare to give way to new generations, and went along the road of conspiracies against Stalin, who supposedly knew nothing about military and other matters. The above excerpts from the transcript of the sedan in November 1937 of the year (together with the wall



grams of the meeting of the Supreme Court on June 1-4, 1937, they occupy a volume of about seven hundred pages of typographical text) - only a drop in that lake of information ("the seas" are still splashing in the archival "shores"), which is declassified today. But these transcripts were published for the first time only in 2006 and 2008 in a circulation, each, in ... 1000 (thousand chu) copies. From them, in particular, it becomes clear that the Red

Army of the 1937 model, through the "efforts" of the Tukhachevskys, was a sad sight, although through the efforts of Stalin, Russia already had an economic and personnel potential that made it possible to quickly bring the army to a completely modern condition. Such work was carried out throughout 1938, 1939, 1940 and the first half of 1941.

Alas, even by the beginning of the war, the consequences of the command of the Tukhachevskys, Gaillites, Levandovskys and others were not completely eliminated.

How not to the end, by the way, it was possible to liquidate all the roots of the Tukhachevsky-Yakir-Uborevich conspiracy. The failures of the first days of the war were grammed with such a strange behavior of some of the higher generals in the last pre-war period and especially in the last pre-war week that this behavior is difficult in some cases to qualify differently, as directly treacherous ... Enough of their "Tukhachevskys" and in the management of the economy. And if the repressions among the managers were fatal for it, then where, one might ask, would the impressive successes of the Soviet economy come from in the period from 1938 to the start of the war? And they were there!

As for the scale, the Red Army was repressed whether - far from having shot all - less than ten percent of the then commanding staff.

Some, by the way, were simply fired from the army and navy. And on July 31, 1937, the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks adopted a special resolution, by which "the regional committees, regional committees and the Central Committee of the national parties" undertook to "ensure the placement of command personnel dismissed from the Red Army, including including those dismissed as expelled from the party due to them."

If historians—"democrats" report on such details of that period, then only in small-circulation specialized publications. By the way, a considerable part of the repressed were only called commanders. So, the "historian" brothers Roy and Zhores Medvedev are presented to the public as the sons "without wine" of the deceased combat commander of the Red Army, brigade commissar Alexander Medvedev. However, their dad was just a philosophy teacher at the military academy, which is why he wore diamonds.

Excluding a minority of those who fell truly innocent victims of not only anti-state, but actually anti-Stalinist provocations of Russia's enemies, the repressions of 1937-1938 removed the bored and incompetent, the lazy and degraded, the ambitious but little knowledgeable. And the young and energetic Soviet specialists who came to take their

place were, after all, taken to leading positions not from the street. Engineers and red commanders are pupils of the Stalin era, they have already gone through a good professional school, learning not so much from the Tukhachevskys as from the most turbulent era, from life itself. They say that youth is a disadvantage, but it quickly passes with age. Well, such a

disadvantage as a lack of experience also disappears over the years. And if you want - also quickly enough.

PLEASE, I will have to say something else about the repressions, since the attempt to present them as the "cannibalistic" arbitrariness of Stalin is, as I have already said, almost the last thing that the "democrats" have left against the era of Stalin. The inevitability of a future conflict in the leadership of the CPSU

(b) could already be seen by the sign

in line with one of the fundamental documents of Trotskyism - the "Platform of the Bolshevik-Leninists (opposition) to the XV Congress of the CPSU (b)". The "Platform" also had a subtitle: "The Crisis of the Party and Ways to Overcome It." The authors identified 13

members of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission. Moreover, attention was drawn not only to the characteristic number "13", but also to the strange order in which the "Platform" was signed - not in order of seniority and not in alphabetical order: Muralov, Evdokimov, Rakovsky, Pyatakov, Smilga, Zinoviev, Trotsky, Kamenev, Peterson, Bakaev, Solovyov, Lizdin, Avdeev. I'm not an expert on

Kabbalah, but something Kabbalah  
the static is felt here.

XV Party Congress ... It was from its rostrum that he left under the whistle of the hall after his provocative speech, the staunch Trotskyist Christian Rakovsky. And it was on it that the opposition gave its most desperate battle to Stalin. It included many brilliant party intellectuals, so the miscalculations and even the vices of the party apparatus, where Stalin was already strong, the opposition noticed correctly. But in its enthusiastic swing against Stalin, the opposition exposed itself. And

behind her speeches, a gloomy prospect for the USSR was visible in the event that the opposition would prevail. About professional party workers, Platforma said: "In fact, the power of this stratum is enormous. It is this layer that is

"managed

tsev" demands "businesslike work" - and is always against discussions.

The platform required:

"To expand the network of party discussion clubs; take a firm course in working out the party apparatus as a whole. workers from the machine tool must constitute a decisive majority of the entire party apparatus, which should not at all consist entirely of salaried persons. A significant part of the work of the Party can and should be carried out free of charge, leaving it to the members of the Party after production or other work. One of the measures regular refreshment of the party apparatus should be the systematic dispatch of part of the comrades from the apparatus to production or to lower work ... "

On paper, it looked catchy and many might like it. However, in reality this would lead to a complete loss of state administration. There were almost no

people with working corns among the leaders of the opposition. If they rubbed them anywhere, it was in tongues. Even with the most daring imagination, it was impossible to imagine Trotsky or Rakovsky (who loved to flaunt in a "butterfly") walking away "from the machine" after a working day in order to immediately go to the plenum of the Central Committee.

It is unlikely that they understood what nonsense they flogged today to drive a locomotive, and tomorrow immediately sit down at the table of the secretary of the city committee and solve the problems of a big city or at least a small village. And then, just having mastered this difficult science, to go on a steam locomotive

again ... Yes, and the Trotskyists talked about "grassroots work", but they did not tolerate it completely. And ok

not one of the 13 authors of the "Platform" went to the wilderness or to the machine tool, so to speak, an example.

Moreover! The famous Elena Stasova from the famous Russian Stasov family told an interesting story in her memoirs. In March 1920, before the Ninth Party Congress, it became necessary to slightly renew the composition of the Central Committee. Stasova and Yevdokimov (the Chekist Efim Georgievich Yevdokimov, not mentioned above, but a prominent member of the Trotskyist-Zinoviev bloc Grigory Yeremeyevich Yevdokimov, who also signed the Platform of the 13) said that they could be withdrawn from the Central Committee. "But here," Stasova reports, "there was such a curiosity: when the results of the vote were summed up, it turned out that I voted for my withdrawal, and Yevdokimov for my retention in the Central Committee. "

However, all the intrigues of the various "oppositions" of the first half of the twenties in the first polo wine of the thirties looked like youthful pranks. Things were getting tighter and tighter.

As early as October 25, 1930, the Politburo Decree (Question No. 13, paragraph 2/7, paragraph c) said: "To oblige Comrade Stalin to immediately stop walking around the city on foot."

In September 1932, Molotov was in Kuzbass. We were returning from another mine, the car was going along a steep embankment. Suddenly she turned off the road and tumbled down the slope, rolled over and stopped at the edge of the ravine. Chekists fled from the escort car to the scene of the accident, but Molotov himself tried to get out of the passenger compartment, and a pale driver stood nearby and cried. Valentin Arnold, a member of the local Trotskyist organization, was let down at the last moment.

nerves, and he began to slow down. He did not feel sorry for Molotov, but he felt sorry for himself.

In Moscow, Trotskyist militants followed the movements of Klim Voroshilov, but the car of the "first red officer" always moved so fast that the attempt had to be canceled. In May 1934, the terrorist Bogdan was already estimating the

shooting distance in the conference room, where Stalin was sitting at the presidium table, but it was far from Stalin. In addition, the nerves of the Trotskyist Bogdan were no stronger than those of the Trotskyist Arnold.

He did not dare to shoot, but the next day he was shot dead in his own apartment by Bakaev, the former chairman of the Cheka in Leningrad and one of Trotsky's "neighbours". In Grazhdanskaya, Bakaev was once almost shot on the orders of Lev Davidovich, and now he himself shot those who hesitated in choosing between Stalin and Trotsky. There were plenty of hesitators then. But if for Trotsky any such "chooser" was a potential ally, then for Stalin he was a potential traitor, a person dangerous

not for Stalin, but for the **cause of** Stalin, which had long become the cause of Russia. Trotsky counted on defectors. Stalin could not rely on them under any circumstances. If we return to the topic of a military conspiracy, then it should be noted that Tukhachevsky also decided whom to choose - Trotsky or *Tukhachevsky*?

Tukhachevsky owed his quick career first to Trotsky's entourage, and then to Trotsky, the Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic. During the Polish war, Tukhachevsky rushed to Warsaw in full accordance with the concepts of his political "boss". However, those were things of the past.

But what happened in the

present? In 1929, Trotsky was expelled from the USSR, and in 1930 his book *Mein Leben* (My Life) was published in Berlin in German. Considering that the book "Mein Kampf" was popular in Germany at that time, certain associations arise. Referring to

the Polish war in the book, Trotsky slandered Lenin, and of course Stalin! He accused Lenin of striving to attack the Poles without restraint. Trotsky would not have been Trotsky if he had not shielded himself here, but on the whole, Lev Davidovich touched on the topic of the Civil War sparingly. He clearly did not want to show which of the handsome

He is loyal to some generals, and to whom he is not. He praised only Ephraim Sklyansky, who by that time had drowned during a business trip to the United States.

Trotsky also kept silent about Tukhachevsky. The calculation here was, of course, with a long-range view, but not only Trotsky counted on Tukhachevsky, but, as already mentioned, Tukhachevsky himself. And around the "bright" personality of the former KomandZap, a number of his old military colleagues have long been grouped.

And their selection was quite definite ...

Nobleman Mikhail Tukhachevsky in the Civil Command of the 8th Army. The Jew Iona Yakir is a member of its Revolutionary

Military Council.

The twenties... Yakir is the best friend of the Jew Gamarnik, who became the political leader of the Red Army. This circle includes the active Trotskyist Smilga, Tukhachevsky's right hand on the Polish Western Front, active Trotskyists from the military: commanders Vitaly Primakov and Vitovt Putna. And here are Feldman, Uborevich, Garkavy, Yakir's deputies Blucher, Dubovoy, Kashirin and dozens of other brilliant commanders, corps commanders, and division commanders who are brilliant or *consider* themselves to be such .

Two former heads of the Political Directorate of the Red Army, Antonov-Ovseenko and Bubnov, also adjoin Trotsky. The head of the Air Force, Alksnis, is an old friend from the open traitor Barmin, who is about to leave our Athenian embassy on the bread of the American special services.

At the end of the twenties, Yakir left to study at the German Academy of the General Staff. After graduation, the old Marshal Hindenburg, President of Weimar Germany, hands him the main military work of Schlieffen "Cannes" with the inscription "God Yakir - one of the talented military leaders of our time." This is an outright moral bribe, since Yakir was not a major military figure even during the Civil War.

Among those who are in close contact with the Reichswehr are Kork, Uborevich,

Fishman. Tukhachevsky, on the other hand, goes to the personal friends of the head of the Reichswehr, General von Seeckt, and knows many other generals of

the Reichswehr. And they know him. Knows Tukhachevsky and Trotsky. But Tukhachevsky knows Trotsky. Lev Davidovich needs a new revolutionary conflagration, but these are new campaigns under the leadership of the fruits of the glory of the Civil War, which have matured in consumption and the subordinates of Tukhachevsky, Yakir, Uborevich, Blucher,

who have stagnated in the "stalls" of command and staff exercises. And now the former lieutenant colonel of the First World War, and now Marshal Egorov and the former lieutenant of the First World War, and now Marshal Tukhachevsky, are talking confidentially about the fact that Stalin "does not understand military affairs." On the other hand, Tukhachevsky is becoming more and more confident that he is well versed in both military affairs and politics and can play in the USSR without Stalin not "second" - under Trotsky,



Let's take into account the following figure: for the twenties and the first

In the late 1930s, five thousand former oppositionists were dismissed from the army. Read Trotskyists. In the party apparatus, in Soviet institutions

There were even more Trotskyists in industry in the mid-thirties. A Trotskyist at that time was already automatically first and foremost an opponent of Stalin's political course and only secondarily a participant in state and industrial work. And for this reason alone, Trotskyism is increasingly becoming a means of sabotage and outright sabotage.

So, on the one hand, the ambitiousness of the "Red Napoleons", on the other, the rr-revolutionary nature of the Red internationalists with a small-town past. Plus - just career adventurers. The mixture is highly explosive.

And this is not a "chimera of the

NKVD", but a reality. Just like reality, Trotsky's public statements: "Dissatisfaction with the military dictates of Stalin puts on

agenda for their possible intervention.

And Trotsky openly calls on the communists in the USSR for a coup d'état. So, the self-appointed

applicants for the highest power in a vast country, there were, in fact, two.

Tukhachevsky was secretly not averse to playing a role or a military dictator, or Trotsky's saber.

Trotsky did not hide his leader's claims. Any of the options meant the death of the country, but was at least one of them real? The country has already become such that it would not let itself be destroyed. In the hour of the crisis, she would have followed Stalin, and therefore the Trotskyist Tukhachev plans were an adventure doomed to failure in advance. With

the exception, however, of one variant of the development of events - the physical elimination of Stalin in at the very beginning of the revolution.

This is where the collapse of the USSR would have been inevitable, because Russia had no replacement for Stalin not only equivalent, but at least for something

suitable. And the collapse of the USSR in the thirties would have meant the collapse of great Russia, which is confirmed by the growing tragedy of Russia after the collapse of the USSR by the enemies of

Russia in 1991. Over the years, a legend arose about Kirov as an alternative to Stalin. However, only naive people who poorly understand the very foundations of the mechanism of the emergence and existence of a supreme political leader could think this way. A lover of beautiful women, Kirov was just as much a figure of the second rank as were Ordzhonikidze, Dzerzhinsky, Frunze, Rykov, Kuibyshev, Bukharin, Kamenev, Rudzutak, Pyatakov, Tomsky and many others. And the large political scale of Kirov was

fully reflected in the fact that he did not think of himself as a replacement for Stalin. It was not servility, but a clear understanding of their capabilities. Kirov was eliminated in December 1934 because he was Stalin's support in Leningrad, formerly "Zinoviev's", that is, Trotskyist. But Kirov did not consider himself capable of carrying the burden of the top leadership of Russia. Kirov could be and was only a conscious and active colleague of Stalin, and nothing more.

It has long been said: "Many are called, but few are chosen  
nyh "...

At that time, Russia had only one chosen one - Stalin.

NEVER, even by the second half of the thirties, Stalin's opponents in the USSR felt very at ease. The future head of the "Red Chapel" - residency of the Intelligence Directorate

The Red Army, a Jew Leopold Trepper, after graduating from Marchlevsky University in 1935, was sent to work in the editorial office of the daily Jewish newspaper Der Emes (Pravda). In fact, it was a publication of Pravda in Yiddish, although there

lis and original materials.

Moshe Litvakov was the editor-in-chief of Der Emes. And he absolutely did not hide from the young employee a malicious and even mocking attitude towards Stalin. In fact, the editor-in-chief actively brought up (and, by the way, brought up) from Trepper opposition Trotskyist. On the

eve of the October anniversary of 1935, Litvakov ordered an article for the anniversary issue of Karl Radek. Radek fulfilled the request quickly, but this is what he heard from Litvakov after the latter read the article: - We will never publish

such crap in our newspaper! - What's the matter? - This is a

continuous  
praising of Stalin ... Then Litvakov added: -  
Listen, Radek! I ordered an  
article from you for the last time. You are greatly  
mistaken in assuming that for the sake of your signature I  
am ready to print anything. Your article is not worth a penny.

That is, the "pro-Stalinist" article did not pass in the EU

Reich organ of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks even in 1935!

And here is a description from nature of Dnepropetrovsk in 1935, made by one of the participants in the All-Union Physical and Chemical Conference, Sergei Frish:

"An unpleasant impression was made by a  
solemn general meeting, at which

Khatayevich, secretary of the regional party committee, spoke. He was a Jew, small in stature, broad-shouldered, with very coarse features. The local authorities, of a lower rank, surrounded him with an obsequious and servile air. Everyone stood up and began to applaud. Someone shouted: "Our great Khataevich! Hooray!" The scene looked completely caricatured. A year or two later I read in the newspaper that he had been shot..."

So whose cults of personalities matured then in quite certain social circles? And could Moshe Litvakov allow himself such openly aggressive behavior if he did not have powerful support and did not count on the very likely fall of Stalin? And who could "dump" Stalin if the masses—both Party and non-Party—followed Stalin? The answer is obvious: the opposition could have tried to do this.

part of the political "tops" and the opposition  
ry-conspirators, wearing on their collars a gim of collars with large  
"commander's" rhombuses. A conspiracy against Stalin by these layers,  
ambitious and

pretentious, narcissistic and historically limited, turned out to be almost inevitable. But in form it was anti-Stalinist, it could no longer be anything other than anti-Soviet and anti-Russian in content.

He showed this well in his book "Moscow . 1937" Lion Feuchtwanger. The "democrats" claim that Stalin simply "rubbed his glasses" on the "innocent writer" and "thrown dust in his eyes." However, acquaintance with the book - thin, but weighty in its historical and political significance, convinces

et in reverse. Feuchtwanger understood everything so precisely that he once again confirmed his class eminent writer and psychologist.

In the chapter "Conformism and individualism", in the chapter "Two classes - fighters and workers," he wrote:

"I noticed one division in the Soviet Union. The young history of the Union is distinctly divided into two epochs: the epoch of struggle and the epoch of construction. Meanwhile, a good fighter is not always a good worker, and it is not at all necessary that a person who has accomplished great deeds during the period of the Civil War should be suitable for the period of construction ... However, now the Civil War has long become history; good fighters who turned out to be worthless workers,

removed from their posts, and it is clear that many of them have now become disgusting kami of the regime.

Feuchtwanger brilliantly recognized the essence of the "leader" of these "fighters", writing as follows:

"Trotsky seems to me a typical only-revolutionary; very useful in times of pathetic struggle, it is of no use where persistent, planned work is required instead of pathetic

sky flashes ... "

Feuchtwanger was present at the trial of the "Parallel Anti-Soviet Trotskyist Center", which took place from January 23 to 30, 1937. And the description of the Pyatakov-Radek trial is devoted in his book to the chapter "Clear and Secret in the Trotsky Trials".

stov".

Feuchtwanger realized that some people do not want to take to this day. And, realizing, he wrote this:

“To explain these processes ... by Stalin's desire for dominance and a thirst for revenge would be simply ridiculous. Joseph Stalin, who, despite the resistance of the whole world, carried out such a grandiose task as the economic construction of the Soviet Union, the Marxist Stalin, guided by personal motives, like some hero from the class writings of high school students, will not harm the foreign policy of his country and thereby the most serious part of his work.

Well, the German Jew Feuchtwanger, an intelligent and subtle writer, gave such a true psychological picture of the process that it convinces the oppositionists of guilt no less weightily than direct transcripts of the trials or now published archival documents. One more comment can be made on the situation. During the days of the

trials of the Trotskyists, Academician Vernadsky wrote in his personal diary, not intended for prying eyes:

“The policy of Stalin-Molotov is Russian and is necessary for the state. Their party enemies are also enemies of the Russian people. .

The academician, although he was a member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, did not like either Stalin or communism. He kept a diary exclusively "for the soul", and not for the curator of the NKVD. But Vernadsky loved Russia, and therefore he understood that only Stalin could lead it forward, and it was the Trotskyists who could destroy and betray the West with their heads.

The opposition gave all its strength to the fight against Stalin, and Stalin increasingly went into the construction of factories, power plants, mines and the oil industry words.

Trotsky prepared the world revolution, and Stalin prepared a new Constitution of the USSR by December 1936, and on December 5 it was adopted by the 8th Extraordinary All-Union

Congress of Soviets. The year 1937 was the last year of the second five-year plan. The country has finally strengthened. In five years, the industrial potential of the USSR tripled in some places, and doubled in some places. Now we smelted steel and pig iron at almost the same rate as Germany, and electric steel at the level of the United States. We have reached the third place in the world in aluminum smelting, having smelted 37 thousand tons of it, but the USA and

Germany were still out of competition here - 132 and 127 thousand tons. The United States in 1937 produced 121 billion kilowatt-

hours of electricity, the Germans - 49, the

British - 17, and the Union - 36. Yes, we still lagged behind the Yankees and the Germans, but ... But in 1932, we only had 13 billion kilowatt-hours - the same as France. France has added five billion in five years, and we have twenty-three! And by the end of the second five-year plan, the Union had as much electricity as France, Italy

Cotton mills sprang up in Leninakan, Fergana, Kirovabad, Baku, Ashkhabad, Tashkent and Barnaul. In Kutaisi, Margelan,

Stalinabad - silk

tal.

In Novosibirsk and Tbilisi - knitwear. In the

second five-year plan, the first Soviet silk and staple viscose appeared. The largest flax mill was opened in Smolensk, and the largest fishing port was opened in Murmansk.

In 1937, the Leningrad "Elektrosila" manufactured the world's first double-hull high-speed (fifty revolutions of a huge rotor **per second!**) turbogenerator with a capacity of 100 thousand kki.

lowatt.

And the Kharkov Turbine Plant named after Kirov became the world's largest plant for turbogenerators and bypassed the British Metropolitan Vickers and the American General Electric. Seven years ago, the engineers of Metropolitan Vickers, who came to work in the USSR on the direction of the company, looked down on us. Now the situation has changed. For seven years! The

Kramatorsk heavy engineering plant outdid the Krupp and Skoda plants. How small the "r-r-

revolutionary" ambitions of the oppositionists looked compared to this real enormity of great deeds transforming the bastard "Race" into a mighty Russian state .

However, the Stalinist leadership was also preparing a real

revolution in the internal life of the USSR. Only not state, but economic! On April 28, 1937, Molotov signed the resolution of the Council of People's Commissars

on the third five-year plan. And it was a plan, the implementation of which gave us a qualitatively different Russia! By 1937, the country had grown stronger, but still lived in poverty. In total,

billions of kilowatt-hours, we produced twice as much electricity as France. And per capita - two times less! And three times less than England, three and a half times less than Germany, five and a half times less than the United States. During the third five-year plan, we had to reduce the gap by almost half ... We should have



whether to increase wages and retail turnover. Stalin's Russia was

preparing to be completely transformed!

HOWEVER, I have not yet said something else... To finally finish the topic of repressions - within the framework of this book, of course - we must not forget about the mass repressions of 1937-1938, which took place not only in the "top", but and in the "lower classes" ... Well, there is something to say about them - unusual for the "democratized" ear ... In the report of the Commission of the

Central Committee of the CPSU (which included P. Pospelov, A. Aristov, N. Komarov), presented to the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU on February 9, 1956 - on the eve of the XX Congress of the CPSU, the following total figures were given for the repressed during these two years ...

1937: arrested: 918,671 people, of which 353,074 people were shot. 1938: arrested: 629,695

people, of which 328,618 people were shot. By the way, it is also indicated there that in 1939

(when Beria was already at the head of the NKVD), 41,627 people were arrested, of which 2,601 people were shot.

I must say right away that only the last two digits should be considered reliable. As for the rest, I will now tell you something about them, drawing the reader's attention to the Jesuit wording of the Pospelovites "arrested" and not "convicted" ... After all, arrest is not

necessarily a sentence. Since 1956 - from the year the defamation of Steel began not only abroad, but also in his homeland - the Khrushchevites and "democrats" have lied so much that they do not always make ends meet. So, in the collection "Lubyanka. Stalin and the GUGB NKVD. 1937-1938, published by the International Endowment for Democracy, on page 659

the following summary data are given of the "statistical reporting of the NKVD for 1937-1938" (I ask the reader to compare with the first figures in this chapter, taken from the collection of the Fund "Rehabilitation. How it was ..."): arrested (and here - "arrest vano") in 1937 - 936,750 people, in 1938 - 638,509 people. The discrepancy between the

"democratic" figures seems to be small, but after all, both times the "count" is given with an accuracy of *one* person. And both times - as I understand it - the "data" are false. How false, for example, is the assertion of Roy and Zhores Medvedev that Nikolai Voznesensky, a member of the Politburo who was arrested in 1949 (for many real sins, it should be noted), was allegedly Stalin's deputy for the State Defense Committee during the war. In reality, the Deputy Chairman of the GKO was at first Molotov, and from 1944 until the abolition of the GKO at the end of 1945, Beria. Voznesensky became *one of* the GKO members only in 1942. Let us return, however, to the figures ... With reference to the operational order of the People's

Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR N.I. Yezhov No. 00447 "on the operation to repress former kulaks, criminals and other anti-Soviet elements" in the report of the Pospelov Commission stated that, according to order No. 00447, it was originally planned to arrest 258,950 people. And this number is even slightly less than the real one, because order No. 00447 provided for a total limit for category I

(execution) of 82.7 thousand people, including 10 thousand already in the NKVD camps, and for category II (from 8 to 10 years of camps or prison) - 193 thousand people. Total - 275,700 people

The data of the report of the Pospelov commission formed the basis of the data of the famous supposedly "secret"

(secretly to the whole world) of Khrushchev's report at the XX Party Congress. Since then, these data have been wandering from one book to another, acquiring the status of an indisputable truth by our days. However,

Khrushchev in "his" report (in quotation marks because, of course, it was not Khrushchev or even Pospelov who prepared the report) if he spoke the "truth" in some places, then, for example, in the following way.

Paragraph 3rd Section II of Order No. 00447 he procured like this:

"In cases where the situation will require an increase in the approved figures, the people's commissars of the republican NKVD and the heads of the regional and regional departments of the NKVD are obliged to submit to me the appropriate reasoned petitions."

There were indeed such words in paragraph 3 of section II of order No. 00447. And from this, Khrushchev and others like him concluded that this de point immediately hinted at the possibility of increasing limits and encouraged "percent mania". But the whole thing looked like this:

"...3. The approved figures are indicative. However, the people's commissars of the republican NKVD and the heads of the regional and regional departments of the NKVD do not have the right to independently exceed them. **Any independent increase in numbers is not allowed (highlights are mine everywhere. - S.K.).** In cases where the situation will require an increase in the approved

figures, the people's commissars of the republican NKVD and the heads of the regional and regional departments of the NKVD

zany submit me appropriate motivated petitions.

**The reduction of numbers, as**

well as the transfer of persons scheduled for repression in the first category, to the second category and vice versa, **is permitted."**

Is it necessary to separately comment on the essence of the trick undertaken by the Khrushchevites with the text of Order

No. 00447? But that's not

all! Firstly, among the repressed were blood bandits! For example, in the Kalinin region, of the approximately 4,000 people shot in the end in the first category, their share was more than 10 percent. And even today's Tver "democratic" historians do not regret their "extrajudicial" fate.

Secondly, in order No. 00447, the total "execution" limit for the regions of the USSR (it was compiled, by the way, **from the credentials** provided **by local** NKVD bodies) was determined at 72.7 thousand people. 193 thousand people were supposed to be repressed in category II. In modern sources, however, with

reference to Pospelov-Khrushchev, the figure appears 681,692 (353,074 + 328,618) only shot in two years.

Where is the truth? In a resolution of the Politburo of the Central

Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks dated July 31, 1931, the start of the KGB repression operation was scheduled for August 5 in all regions of the Union, with the deadline for a number of regions being August 15. The entire operation was ordered to be completed within 4 months, that is, by the time of the first elections under the new Constitution of the USSR to the Supreme

Soviet. In reality, the operation continued until about the spring, and in some places even until November 1938, and th

had their objective reasons. The repressions were not carried out indiscriminately and not just like that - an investigation was conducted, it gave new names, connections, etc., and the deadlines had to be extended. As a result, the total number of repressed seriously exceeded the original limits. But

how much? I

think it is no coincidence that the final figures for the regions and regions cannot be found even today. But there are some things

you can learn. So, on September 8, 1937, Yezhov, in special message No. 59750, reported to Stalin:

"In total, as of September 1 of this year, 146,225 people were arrested. Of these, 69,172 former kulaks, 41,603 criminals and 35,454 Lovek - counter-revolutionary elements. Of this number of those arrested, 31,530 were sentenced to death and 13,669 to imprisonment in camps and prisons.

century."

I immediately draw the reader's attention to the high percentage of criminals - 28 percent of all those arrested. And there is no doubt that they were really criminals. Yezhov had no reason to list kulaks or former "belyaks" among them - there were more than

a lot of.

Further... Simple arithmetic shows that out of 146,225 people arrested, only 45,199 people were repressed. That is 101 026 che

Lovek were not repressed a month after the arrest. I do not think that all of them were simply released, but obviously a considerable number of them escaped, most likely, with stress.

As regards what follows, it must be said that for some regions, the increase in limits - upon requests from the field - was subsequently very significant, especially in category I. In the Krasnoyarsk Territory, for example, from the initial 750 people - up to 7350 people, in the Omsk Region - from one to eight thousand people, in the Orenburg Region - from 1500 to 3500 ... In the Leningrad Region,

the initial "execution" limit of 4000 people was increased to 5500 people. With all this, by September 1, 1937, 146,225

people were arrested in the USSR during the KGB operation, and 31,530 people were shot. These figures are exact - they are given in 2003 without comment by the International Foundation for Democracy! And according to Pospelov-Khrushchev, in 1937 918,671 people were allegedly arrested, of which 353,074 people were shot. Of course, September 1 is not December 31. But if 30,000 people were shot in the first

month of repressions - and this was all over the Union, in 64 local people's commissariats and NKVD departments - then

in the four months remaining before the end of the year, it was, excuse me, unrealistic to shoot ten times more. And the limits - even increased ones - do not come close to giving the figure of three hundred and fifty thousand shot in 1937 alone. I think that the

total number of those repressed in category I, that is, those sentenced to death (which did not always mean a real execution), exceeded the initial limit of order No. 00447 by about three times and no more than four times, and amounted to two hundred and fifty - three hundred thousand people in two years .

Quite a few ... Although up to fifty thousand of them were, I remind you, just dangerous bandits, whom

liquidated using extrajudicial methods. Practice, in principle, is not so reprehensible body.

The above calculations are, of course, very approximate, but, as scientists say, the order phenomena they reveal and show: almost a milli

It is not confirmed by objective data that there were executed "victims of the Great Terror"! However, what up to this "democrats"! And in

the pocket encyclopedic dictionary History of the Fatherland, published in 2003 by the scientific (!) publishing house Big Russian Encyclopedia, we are assured that in 1937-1938 seven million people were arrested in the USSR, and three million died or were shot. Well, who is more? After all, even the Khrushchevites put into circulation, although maliciously overestimated, but not so shamelessly bottomless false figures. However, the absolute record of lies was set, perhaps, not by

"historians". It seems to

have been put up by a physicist, Academician Sakharov. In his "Memoirs"

He wrote:

"To investigate an emergency (in 1951, a sheet containing all the geometry and all the data of the first hydrogen bomb !!! - S K. disappeared without a trace ) from the Ministry (the Ministry of Medium Machine Building was formed on June 26, 1953, and before That was why there was a PGU under the Council of Ministers of the USSR - S K.) the head of the secret department arrived - a man who aroused physical horror in me already with his appearance, his fixed gaze from under his hanging eyelids; he was the head of Lenin

city government GB during the so-called of the "Leningrad case", when about 700 top leaders were shot in the city ... "

For a representative of the exact sciences, Andrei Dmitrievich admitted, firstly, an unforgivable stylistic carelessness - the number of senior leaders, and even in one city, in any case, is not in the hundreds, but in units. But the main thing is that in the "Leningrad case" - quite, by the way, justifiably - 23 (twenty-three) people were sentenced to capital punishment. This is an absolutely accurate figure taken from the certificate of the Minister of Internal Affairs Sergey Kruglov and his deputy Ivan Serov dated December 10, 1953, presented by them to Khrushchev as part of the preparation for the rehabilitation of the "Leningraders" (214 people were sentenced in total, while to various terms of imprisonment - 85 people, one - to compulsory treatment in a psychiatric hospital, the rest - to deportation).

So, if the standard "lie ratio" of Democrats is about 10, then Sakharov's "lie ratio" was  $700 : 23 = 30.43$  times!

Accordingly, "tens of millions" of "prisoners of the Gulag" existed and still exist only in the malicious fantasies of slanderers against Stalin. By the way, the most famous of these "prisoners" is Solzhenitsyn (wow, how God and the people just awarded her the names of his ancestors and himself!), Having gone through "all the horrors of the GU LAG", he lived up to 90 (ninety!) years without any problems ...

And he is not alone! In the second, supplemented edition of my book "Beria: the best manager of the 20th century", I examined the topic of repressions - especially in the "lower classes" in more detail, but here I will simply report that the political reality of the second half of the 30s in the



the presence within the country of not only the "top", but also the "grassroots" "fifth column", and the repressions of 1937-1938 greatly weakened it, although not destroyed to the end.

These "grassroots" repressions also hooked on a part of the innocent - which Stalin later recognized. But the fault was not Stalin, and often not the Chekists themselves, for the most part honestly fulfilling their duty. The main costs of "grassroots" repressions were explained by the activities of the surviving and unexposed Trotskyists, anti-Sovietists, were explained by everyday slander and other similar things, including the dirty tricks of dirty tricks from among Vanek and Manek.

As for the main contingent of the repressed, let me remind you that during the war, about 800,000 Soviet citizens fought or served on the side of Germany (this is without the "Vlasovites"). If not for the repressions of 1937-1938, their number would most likely have been one and a half to two million. And the victory of Russia would then have come at an even more bloody price, because it would have been necessary to break the more powerful resistance of the Reich and its henchmen.

That is, the repressions of 1937-1938 were to no small extent the nature of Russia's preventive war against its potential traitors. But even today's "democrats" do not condemn the post-war executions of Nazi accomplices from among Soviet citizens. But, by the way, it was not the repressions

that marked the era of Stalin in the first place! First of all, it was the era of the comprehensive development of Russia, the era of its growing power and greatness ...

IN THAT SAME 1913, from which all statistics have long been "dancing" and which is considered the peak of achievements of tsarist Russia, its housing stock was

lyal 180 million square meters. At the same time, the real standard of living in the cities for the working people was the norm of a punishment cell - one and a half square sazhen or two cubic ones. An apartment in St. Petersburg was owned by 28 percent of working families, a room by 17 percent, and half a room by 46 percent. Another five percent "had" "corners".

So, almost half of the working-class families in the Russian capital had half a room for everything about everything ... Kiss, give birth, walk and die - all in the conditions of "widest publicity" ...

Study ?

Uh-uh, this one - fig!

October came, the Civil War passed. The time has come for the "Housing redistribution" - the apartment reform of 1918-1922. Sixty-four percent of families moved into apartments, forty-six percent into rooms. But housing redistribution is not yet housing construction. It was ahead.

At first - not so hot. Eleven years before the first five-year plan, NEP Russia built 43 million square meters of housing. In the twelve years after the first five-year plan, socialist Russia built three times as much: 123 million. 523 new cities and 495 new urban settlements appeared on the map of new Russia. And these were not just new settlements. Each city and town is a new

plant or factory, mine or mine. And before their construction, it was necessary to carry out surveys, make projects, and train personnel.

Their

personnel, because a self-respecting country cannot depend on foreign specialists.

True, not all foreigners came to the USSR at that time only for high earnings. They also came for new ideas or with their own new ones.

ideas. Thus, it was in Moscow in 1934, the outstanding architect of the 20th century, the French constructivist Le Corbusier, who realized his first major and brilliant construction and architectural concept, erecting the building of the Central Union (now the building of the Central Statistical Office) near the Kirovskaya metro station. A new word "reconstruction" came into use...

Archimedes needed one point of support to turn the world upside down. Reconstruction, that is, industrialization, collectivization and cultural revolution became the fulcrum that allowed Stalin and the people of Russia to turn Russia over in one, in fact, five-year period. Moreover, turn from a lazy head to working legs,

after which the head no longer had to be lazy! But could everything be smooth here? Well, Stalin himself answered this question

at the Kremlin reception in honor of the metallurgists on December 26, 1934:

"We had too little technical literate people. We were faced with a dilemma: either start with training people in technical literacy schools and postpone the production and mass operation of machines for ten years until technically literate personnel are developed in schools, or proceed immediately to the creation of a machine

tires and develop their mass exploitation in the national economy, so that in the very process of production and operation of machines, people can be trained in technology, and cadres should be developed. We have chosen the second way. We went open and

deliberately on the inevitable costs and overexpenditures associated with the lack of technically trained people who know how to handle machines. True, we have broken a lot of cars during this time. But on the other hand, we won the most precious thing - time, and created the most valuable thing in the economy - personnel. In three or four years we have created a cadre of technically literate people both in the production of machines of all kinds (tractors, automobiles, tanks, aircraft, etc.) and in the field of their mass exploitation. What has been done in Europe for tens of years, we have been able to do in the rough and basically within three or four years. Costs and overruns, machine breakdowns and other losses have more than paid off."

And on May 4, 1935, in a speech in the Kremlin Palace at a reception in honor of graduates of the Red Army academies (Pravda published the speech on May 6), Stalin said:

"We inherited from the old time, a technically backward and semi-impoverishing, devastated country ... Devastated by four years of imperialist war, devastated again by three years of the Civil War, a country with a semi-literate population, with low technology, with separate

oases of industry, sinking among a sea of the smallest peasant farms - this is the kind of country we inherited from the past ... "

After all, there was not the slightest exaggeration in such an assessment - Stalin still did not remember everything. But what was said about the past only anticipated the main, urgent, what Stalin said to melt

"The task was to make this country to switch off the rails... of darkness onto the rails of modern industry and mechanized agriculture... The question was: either we will solve this problem in the shortest possible time... or... our country... will lose its independence and turn into object of the game of the imperialist powers..." It was necessary to create a first-

class industry... And for this it was necessary to make sacrifices and introduce the strictest economy in everything, it was necessary to economize on food, and on schools, and on manufactory in order to accumulate the necessary funds to create an industry ... It is clear that in such a big and difficult undertaking ... success can be identified only after a few years. Therefore, it was necessary to arm yourself with strong nerves, Bolshevik restraint and stubborn patience in order to overcome the first setbacks and steadily move forward ... "

From the point of view of Russian grammar, Stalin spoke in the past tense. However, the time he spoke about, and from a historical point of view, has already passed into the past.

As for the place where Stalin said this, the receptions in the Kremlin themselves were also a detail of the new. Previously, the highest power, that is, the tsar, arranged receptions for diplomats, the nobility, well, graduates of the Academy of the

General Staff. And now Trud was welcomed in the Kremlin halls. And one could say without exaggeration that it was Free Labor. Unless, of course, you mean by freedom not the ability to do what you want, but the conscious need for honest participation in the creative life of society.

After all, true freedom is possible only where a person is deprived of the right covered by the "law" to harm others and rob them, thereby solving their personal problems. Such freedom - freedom from *rednecks* of all sorts -

began to take shape in the USSR. The foreign Trotskyist Isaac Deutscher talked about the "compulsory" nature of labor in Soviet Russia, but in reality the country faced another problem—learning how to work. Just work, day in and day out. Alas, not everyone in the workers' and peasants' state was ready for this. And just in the years of

the first five-year plan - that is, when work began "in earnest and for a long time", the concept of "flyer" appeared. Not a good concept, but it alone refuted the chatter about "Soviet slavery." Happened at the same

time and another concept in contrast to the first - "self-reinforcing".

In 1930, large-scale industry lost 16 (sixteen) million man-days due to absenteeism, in 1931 - 25 (twenty-five) million. Oblomovs from Russian life are not so easy to use

scratched.

Moreover! A new type of them arose - the active, Ilfo-Petrovsk engineer Talmudovsky, in search of a better "salary", climbed even to the construction of the Turkestan-Siberian Railway and, having snatched off the next "lift", immediately disappeared. Less well known are his rural "colleagues", described by the excellent

Soviet writer Valentin Ovechkin in the essay "Without clan, without tribe". In the late thirties, Ovechkin wrote:

"The restless seekers of rich labor until the day they are called in the villages "collective farmers until the first hail-breaker." There are people who have made

traveling from place to place, from collective farm to collective farm, is a kind of profession, profitable and not particularly difficult, except for road inconveniences ... "

Yes, here it would indeed be useful to think about forced labor. Here is the geography of "travels" of only one, described by Ovechkin, "Talmudic from the plow": Transbaikalia, Siberia, Kuban, Bashkiria , Kazakhstan, Don ... At the same

time, however, a massive new attitude to work and to one's own country arose. Already in the autumn of 1930, in Leningrad alone , two hundred thousand engineers, technicians, and skilled workers pledged... Reader, I draw your special

attention to the fact that they simply pledged not to leave their enterprises until the end of the first five- **year plan** . every ... third metal

sheet.

Just one of three. What about the other two?

And they preferred to look out and guess where to go to work: either to Dnepropetrovsk, or to Dneprodzerzhinsk, or to Zaporozhye, or to Mariupol ... There were not many more experienced old metalworkers in the early years of industrialization than new factories!

It is common for a person, although not for everyone, to look for "where it is better". However, the past life with its serfdom did not give the Russian people very many such opportunities.

And not only Russians. Need drove migrants across the ocean from Ireland, from Italy, from the Austro-Hungarian part of Ukraine ...

For thousands of years, the main incentives for work for the worker were the lash, hunger, the same need ... Less often - the thirst for profit, which was quenched by one in a hundred. Now, for the first time in the history of man, a whole a huge country, stretching over a sixth of the world, had to find new labor relations regulators to replace the old ones. Including conscience. Even earlier, the cadre worker had a working conscience, professional pride. But the benefit of this was not to him, but to his master. Now it was necessary to use this conscience as almost a planned element of the economy, improving the life of millions the more, the more "conscientiously", consciously they worked. In the early thirties, the entire Soviet Union traveled the English industrialist Gartel. Here

his words:

"Enthusiasm was never born out of slavery. If Soviet Russia, under the implementation If the five-year plan was dependent on forced labor, it would fall apart on the next same day."

Well said! And - exactly! Is not it?  
The future

prime minister of independent India, Jawaharlal Nehru, could not then travel through the USSR. He then "traveled" from one Indian prison to another. But, having devoted himself to the cause of the people, he already understood our difficulties and our aspirations so well. On July 9, 1933, he wrote to his daughter from another prison:

"In the Soviet Union, the principle is: "He who does not work, he does not eat!" But in addition to this motive, the Bolsheviks set in motion



a new incentive to work: to work for the sake of public welfare. In past this incentive lay at the basis of the activity of idealists and rare individuals, but there was no society as a whole that assimilated and reacted to such an impulse to activity.

The true basis of capitalism is All competition and personal gain, always obtained at the expense of others. In the Soviet Union, this motive of personal gain gave way to a social incentive: the workers in Russia, as one American writer put it, learn that "by recognizing mutual dependence bridge, independence from need and fear..."

By the way, Nehru was able to see at a distance such an important sign of a new life in Russia.  
these:

"Getting rid of the terrible fear of poverty and insecurity everywhere flowing over the masses, is a great asset. It is said that the elimination of this threat almost completely put an end to mental illness in the Soviet Union.

The latter was only wishful thinking, not real, but the existence of *such* rumors about the USSR in the 1930s, which even reached India, speaks for itself! Not only could the clever English

capitalist Gartel or Nehru, a fighter against British rule in India, have an honest look at the new Russia, but

and the French painter Albert Marcheux, one of the outstanding artists of the 20th

century. His urban and seascapes are rarely and sparsely populated by people, but in almost every one of them there is not an idle observer, but a worker and his work. For Marqueu, labor is a necessary part of nature inhabited by man. Perhaps only one of his younger contemporaries, Georgy Nissky of Soviet Russia, fully possessed the same ability to fill the landscape with a sense of human creation, even without the presence of man on the ground.

canvas.

Marko traveled all over Europe, and in 1934 he came to the USSR: Leningrad, Moscow, Kharkov, Tbilisi, Batumi ...  
On

August 23, 1934, the newspaper "Soviet Art

in "posted his article with the revealing title

I eat: "Renewed life. Artist's Impressions. Marqueu understood politics as little as he knew painting well. But he knew how to see life, and therefore he singled out the main thing in the life of a foreign country he saw - **renewal!**

Then he openly admired the amazing country where money plays no role, marveling at the unselfishness of the youth of this country...

IN THAT SAME 1934, when the French artist Marqueux traveled around the USSR, the Soviet artist Georgy Nissky was thirty years old. The son of a paramedic from the Belarusian junction station Novobelitsa, at eighteen he was sent to Moscow to study at the Vkhutemas - All-Russian Art and Theater Workshops. In old Russia, there were two main types of artist: 1) recognized wealthy  
and 2) talented, recognized, but poor.

Often there were, however, talented, none shchie and unrecognized.

But how could any Russian artist in the old days imagine his life as Nissky described it: "I comprehended the skill of volleyball deeper, faster and more perfectly than the skill of painting, and I confess that I often painted in fits and starts between competitions and matches. The net and the flying ball fascinated me more."

In the gym, and not in the workshop, Nyssky met Alexander Deineka, who was four years older. Nissky wrote: "I met and fell in love with Deineka. It is clear why. I had healthy, fast legs, strong biceps. I was healthy and young, a new person was growing in me. And in his drawings and canvases, for the first time, I saw a new life, environment and those people with whom I

met on the street, in workshops, on the sports field..."

Yes, in new Russia even great artistic talent was sometimes inferior to sports passion, and in old Russia even "pure" athletes lacked neither talent nor passion. At the Olympic Games in Stockholm in 1912, the Russian football team lost to the German team with a score of **"0:16 (zero-sixteen)"**! In Russia, it was then regarded as "sports Tsushima". So after all, the entire then Olympic team of Russia took 15th place out of 18!

By the way, the "Russian" Olympic team is moving more and more, it seems, to

something like that. Yes, it is not surprising - after all, the Yeltsinoid "Rossiya" is in the closest "spiritual" relationship with the old "Raseya". As for Stalin's Russia, in 1932 - just two decades after the tsarist "sports Tsushima" -

sports clubs in the USSR were engaged in

twenty times more athletes than there were in the Russian Empire in the year of the Tsushima football. From a fifty-thousand "white" public to a million young working-class boys and girls—this is the path traversed by Stalin's Russia on the 15th anniversary of October! But this is not counting the new millions of boys and girls accustomed to the sun and water!

Nissky in 1932, after two years of service in the Red Army in the Far East, painted the landscape "Autumn. Semaphores "...

A low horizon, a reddish strip of land with railway tracks, steel strands of wires with swallows on them, a clear, spacious gray sky with light patches of white clouds ... There, upwards, clouds of white smoke of a steam locomotive rushing past under the entrance semaphores, on one of which the red "wing" flying up shows: "The way is open." A year later, the

painting "On the Tracks" appeared, where the figurine of a girl in a white dress with a book in her hand is not lost against the backdrop of the station expanse of track, but becomes a sign of life, possible only now, here, in this country.

Nissky admitted: "I have more intimacy with a semaphore than with a birch. steam locomotive vyra healthier and more modern than Levitan's mop, around it is our current mood.

But this *today* 's Nyssa did not press at genus, but fit into it.

A little later, in 1937, in the same year when Moscow Trotskyists sat on the benches of the "Moscow trials", while Trotsky himself published articles in London and New York about the "gloomy Stalinist tyranny", a friend of Nissky Deinek would write his best, perhaps canvas, "Sevastopol. Future pilots "... That time gave many pictures, as if expressing

time-consuming, but it is hardly possible to find another that belongs both to the present of the new country and to its future.

Expanse of

sea and sky... Seaplanes.. Sun... And three sitting figures - an adult and two boys, looking at the waters of the summer bay and, at the same time, at their sunny tomorrow. Worker Porfiry Polosukhin worked in

Sverdlovsk before serving in the Navy. Six years before Deinekov's future pilots sat down on the Sevastopol embankment to watch the flights, the Red Navy sailor Polosukhin watched, together with his comrades from the deck of the cruiser, how a black dot separated from the seaplane that had gained altitude over the same bay. The famous skydiver Leonid Minov jumped over the Black Sea for the first time in history.

It won't be long before a Russian working guy from the Urals becomes a famous balloon pilot and test paratrooper himself. In Stalin's USSR, this did not require titles or money. It was enough ability and desire. The motto of life became: "He who is cheerful, he laughs, he who wants, he will achieve." In August 1935, at the All-Union parachute rally, Polosukhin met the inventor of the backpack parachute,

Gleb Evgenievich Kotelnikov. Before the revolution, Kotelnikov's project was considered by the Commission of the Military-Technical Directorate of General Kovanko. The general smiled ironically : - All this is wonderful. But really, who are you going to save? - So how? the inventor did not understand. - If your escapee jumps out of the

molyot, then he will no longer need to be saved! -  
Why?

- Because his legs will come off from the push.

- ???!!

Yes, legs...

But Kovanko was not the worst. He himself rose into the air on tethered balloons, in 1909 he made a free flight in a balloon, in aviation his son served.

White émigrés in Paris mocked "neve natural Moscow commissars", taking over to govern Russia, but here is the documented opinion of the "enlightened" tsarist chief of the Russian Air Force, Grand Duke Alexander Mikhailovich: "A parachute in aviation is a generally harmful thing, since pilots at the slightest danger threatening from the enemy, will be saved by parachute, representing the planes of death. This is how one of the highest official figures of tsarist Russia and the closest relative of

the current "democratic" candidate for the first place in the history of Russia "believed" in the fighting qualities of even the best Russian officers. In Soviet Russia, they would not even laugh at such an opinion, they would not even shrug their shoulders ... On

July 12, 1935, it was raining over the Tushino airfield. However, he did not cool the mood of the athletes of the

Central Aeroclub. Stalin and Voroshilov arrived. The air show has begun. Gliders and airplanes took off. Instructors Po Losukhin and Shchukin, with a Moscow worker Koskin, jumped long jumps from three U-2s, and fifty paratroopers jumped from two heavy TBs.

Pilot-ace Alekseev amused the audience with the number "The first independent flight of a student pilot."

The plane twitched in the air, fell over, on landing it gave a strong "goat" - it jumped ridiculously ...

Everyone laughed merrily, and Alekseev was already dialing you into a cell to demonstrate a masterful landing from the next turn of a multi-turn corkscrew.

Turn, second ... fifth ... And, without leaving the sixth, the car crashes into the Moscow River. Fountain of splashes and complete silence of the

audience. An ambulance breaks off from the start, after a couple of minutes it returns to the group led by Stalin.

And out of it crawls out ... wet, with a bandaged head, embarrassed Alekseev: - Comrade People's

Commissar of Defense, pilot Alekseev had an accident.

- Reason? - Rain, wet, last

minute boots

with

slipped off the pedal.

Maybe, of course, Alekseev just made a mistake in the treatment, but how can you scold him? Voroshilov, one Ko, deliberately frowns, but then Stalin strides broadly towards the loser and shakes his hand. Then he silently hugs.

And again the planes go into the air ...

A trifle? No - Stalin's style. An involuntary mistake - especially **one's own** - can be forgiven. Negligence - even one's own - is impossible. And even

more so, it is impossible to forgive sabotage and sabotage **by strangers**.

And here is such a

detail... In the 80s of the 20th century, the American professor Lauren Graham was indignant at the fact that when, at the end of the 20s of the 20th century, Stalin began to pursue a policy of accelerated industrialization, he allegedly "ignored" at the same time health issues

research and "counted public hygienists

dangerous opponents.

It must be assumed that it was only through an oversight that Stalin did not consider here also Korney Chukovsky with his Moidodyr, and at the same time Vladimir Mayakovsky, as a dangerous opponent. Indeed, in his "Story about the people of Kuznetskstroy," Mayakovsky directly wrote: "The workers are lying under the old cart. / The workers are sitting in the mud, sitting, burning a torch. / The darkness has reduced to a wrinkle - an unimportant wet comfort, / the workers sit in the dark, chewing wet bread. What kind of hygiene is there - sheer unsanitary conditions ... However, Graham did not see beyond his own anger

at Stalin. And here is what the prominent American historian of

medicine Henry Siegerist saw in the year of the "Moscow trials", in the year 1937:

"Today, a new era in the history of medicine begins in the Soviet Union. All that has been achieved in medicine in the previous five millennia constitutes only the first stage, the stage of medical medicine. A new era, the era of preventive medicine, originates in the Soviet Union."

Like

this! And, of course, Siegerist was right. In tsarist Russia in 1913 there were 9 (nine) antenatal clinics and children's polyclinics. And in the USSR in 1940 - almost **nine thousand**, headed by the State

institute for the protection of motherhood and infancy.

In Moscow in 1913, 22 people died every year.

squish out of a thousand, and in 1931 - less than 13.

That's why the workers of Kuznetskstroy sat in the mud, after which Mayakovsky repeated: "In four years there will be a garden city here" ... After all, he later grew up.



BIG is really better seen "at a distance". However, even at a distance one must be able to see. Lenin spent half of his conscious life before the revolution in exile. And better than many of her "guardians" who did not leave Russia, he was able to consider in a Russian person not only a bad worker, but also a **person who** is quite capable of "casting away all despondency, clenching his teeth, gathering all his strength, straining every nerve, stretch every muscle and go forward. Able to see big and Napoleon. He never wore

kosovorotkas and oily boots, but he also correctly assessed a Russian person: "There is no better Russian sol

date under his **right** guidance." Alas, the

Russian people were rarely led **by** **rightly** - in the interests, if not of himself, then at least in the interests of his Fatherland, and not the whims of the lord's "ndrava" and belly. Yaroslav the Wise and several other Kyiv and Vladimir-Suzdal grand dukes, Alexander Nevsky, Ivan Kalita, Dimitry Donskoy, Ivan III, with all the dislocations of nature - Ivan

IV the Terrible, then the clever Peter... That's all, in fact, the truly great leaders of Russia throughout its entire pre-revolutionary history.

The era of Catherine II was strong by Rumyantsev, Potemkin, Suvorov, and Catherine herself it was worth it if she knew how to appreciate such employees and publicly declared: "May Heaven shame all those who undertake to govern the peoples, not having in mind the true good of the state." In fact, Catherine too often deviated from this principle herself, but it was still a way of thinking that was fundamentally different from the views of Louis XIV: "The state is me" and the principle of life of the French aristocracy of the times of Louis XV: "After us, at least after

top"...

In the first half of the nineteenth century, tsarist Russia managed to place only Kutuzov, Count Mordvinov and a galaxy of heroes of the "thunderstorm of the 12th year" into the ranks of leaders worthy of her people ... But were these also pupils of the Catherine's century or their direct students.

Another surge *in the correct* leadership of the Russian people came in the Sevastopol epic of 1854-1855. Its naval leaders turned out to be quite worthy of the people whose sons they gave orders. Of the fifteen thousand sailors who went ashore to defend Sevasto

pol, five hundred survived. Their

top commanders - Admirals Kornilov, Istomin, Nakhimov - *all died*. That is, in the

conditions of tsarist Russia in the second half of the last century, one had to pay for the right to *the correct* leadership of the Russians

life.

Russia developed poorly by the force of things rather than by the force of the state's mind. The largest figure in the times of Alexander I and Nicholas I, the Minister of Finance, Count Kankrin, considered railways to be "a harmful disease of our century." As a result, Russia received the Crimean catastrophe. The

brother of the "tsar-liberator" Alexander II, Grand Duke Konstantin, two years after the Crimean feat of the people and the Crimean shame of the monarchy, "ingeniously" found a source of replenishment of the treasury in the sale of Russian America. In a letter to Chancellor Gorchakov, he justified his idea by "the cramped position of state finances."

The newspaper of the publisher of the famous "Otechestvennyye za pisok" Krayevsky "Voice", itself surprised at its own courage, wrote:

"Today Russian American colonies are selling rumors; who will guarantee that won't the same rumors start selling the Crimea, Transcaucasia, Ostsee provinces? There will be no business for hunters ... What a huge mistake and imprudence was the sale of our Ross colony on the coast of gold-bearing California; But is it possible to repeat such a mistake now? And does the feeling of national pride really deserve so little attention that it could be sacrificed for some 5-6 million dollars? Is it possible that the labors of Shelikhov, Baranov, Khlebnikov and other people selfless for Russia should be used by foreigners and collect their fruits for their own benefit?

Kraevsky also forgot to say about the dreams of Mihail Lomonosov, who, a hundred years before the frisky princely and royal combinations, was sure that in those parts "it is possible to establish settlements, a good fleet with a considerable number of military people, Russians and Siberian subjects of pagan peoples", and that "Russian power will grow through Siberia and the Northern Ocean and will reach the main European settlements in Asia and **America.**"

Lomonosov wrote:

"If the great glory of our hearts is not moves, then a reproach from all of Europe should move, that, having **both ends** of the Siberian Ocean and putting already noble dependents on it with good success, we are leaving everything in vain.

Alas, even the great coast-dwellers did not foresee the turnaround of the "tsars": they did not leave the distant Russian lands at *the other* end of the "Siberian Ocean" in vain, but lowered them in 1867 like a pair of uncomfortable boots. A contemporary of Alexander II, Kraevsky also did

not

expected from his monarch such a criminal act, as the surrender of Russia's grandiose geopolitical prospects in the Pacific to one of Russia's most serious geopolitical adversaries, the North American United States. However, Alaska, the Aleutian Islands with the rest of the islands of the northwestern zone of the Pacific Ocean, the Alexander archipelago (named after the uncle of Emperor Alexander II - Emperor Alexander I) and a number of Russian mainland North American lands

sold not rumors, but "kings".

They gave away a possible brilliant Russian future in the Far East not for five or six,

true, but for seven million two hundred thousand dollars. Although those who know how to count the St. Petersburg "Birzhevye Vedomosti" and this price was considered negligible. Well, let's figure it out ...

The dollar exchange rate then was one ruble sixty kopecks in gold. In total, the grandfather of Nicholas the Bloody sold Russian America to the Yankees for 11 million 520 thousand rubles. And in that year, when the great-uncle of Nicholas the Bloody, Grand Duke

Konstantin, first proposed this profitable family gesheft, that is, in 1857, the budget of the Ministry of the Imperial Court (balls, parades, lackeys, receptions, dinners, trips, and so on, and so on) ) was determined at 11 million 653 thousand 600 rubles.

Ten years later, in 1867, when the supposedly "unprofitable possessions" in America were sold off by the "kings," the same "civil list" of the emperor was worth 10,933,500 rubles.

Revenues of the state budget of Russia, including the same year amounted to almost 439 million rubles.

It turns out that the sale of Alaska increased the revenues of the Russian budget by only two and a half percent in one single year!

Well, how can you not agree with Birzhevka?!

I think it would be useful to cite the opinion of the Russian naval officer Golovin, who, in response to assurances that such a deal would improve, they say, Russian-American relations, wrote:

"As regards the strengthening of friendly relations between Russia and the United States, it can be positively said that the sympathy of the Americans for us will manifest itself as long as it does not oblige them to anything or as long as it is beneficial for them. But; Americans will never sacrifice their interests for simple beliefs ."

I would write the last quote in bold type on the cobblestones of Red Square - especially for Yeltsinoid lovers of "strategic partnership" with the States.

Americans are incapable of sacrificing their own interests, but Alexander II also sacrificed not his own interests, but the interests of Russia. The son, Emperor Alexander the Third, followed in the footsteps of his father. It is he who owns the spectacular phrase: "Russia has only two true allies: its army and navy." He spoke correctly, did badly: the Russian army was moving in the long run towards the fall of Port Arthur, towards Mukden, and the fleet towards Tsushima. And

just under the last Alexander, French capital through the banks of the Rothschilds began to occupy Russia with the result that

After a couple of decades, even the Congress of Noble Societies considered deplorable for the future of the country.

Well, the management of Russia by the son of the last Alexander, the last Nikolai, was assessed by the Russian scientist Grum-Grzhimailo: "stupid management". And I can only agree with him. However, the responsibility for such "management", stupid, petty-

greedy and ruthless towards the fate of Russia, must be shared with the crowned cretins by thousands of greedy industrial and financial

tycoons, and tens of thousands of large landowners of the nobility - Rurikovich, Gediminovich and others, who clipped the wings of even these crowned birds of low flight. After all, before the reform of 1861, the "tsar-liberator" did not know what he was more afraid of - a peasant revolt while maintaining

serfdom or palace translation  
company after its cancellation.

Now, in the turbulent and stormy years of the 20th century, after Lenin's premature departure from the life of Russia, a man stood at the head of a huge country, who had already been threatened more than once by both dark revolts "from below" and ambitious coups "from above".

And he calmly - with greatness and calmness  
true state genius - he met dangers and overcame them. And the only thing that did not threaten him for sure was confusion. Not before October, he wrote:

"The revolutionary cry given by our party is not understood by all in the same way. The workers began to arm themselves. They, the workers, are much more perspicacious than many "intelligent" and "enlightened" intellectuals. The soldiers did not lag behind the workers. Not so with the other strata... The bourgeoisie knows where the crayfish hibernate. She took

Yes, "without further ado" put up guns at the Winter Palace. Agents of the bourgeoisie have launched a campaign against our Party. Their echoes broke out into an appeal, urging "not to come out." And the frightened neurasthenics have become unbearable, for they "cannot remain silent any longer" and beg us to tell us at last when the Bolsheviks will come out. In a word, if you do not count the workers and soldiers, then truly: "the mutineers surrounded many fat ones," slandering and informing, threatening and pleading, questioning and interrogating ...

Cheerfully, with humor, young Stalin wrote these lines in 1917. Thirteen years passed, and again they surrounded him from all sides - slandering, begging, in the past, cursing ... The country left tsarism,

but did not leave itself. Called in 1930 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in terms of its national psychology, it then remained in many respects Pugachev's "Race", and even more Oblomov's...

The Russian peasant stuffed calluses from morning to night - he was so used to it. But as he sweated his body, he was not inclined to make mental efforts to brainwash a little and organize together towards a smarter, more meaningful life. And this bifurcation of the people's share has not given for a long time for true Russian patriots... Alexander

Nikolaevich Engelhardt, little known to the reader, until the age of thirty-eight was a professor of chemistry at the St. Petersburg Agricultural Institute, and in 1871 he was sent under police supervision to his own estate, Batishchevo, in the Smolensk province, for populist propaganda among students. There he created a model economy. He described the Russian village beautifully and very accurately.

He was eagerly quoted by Lenin, who believed that Engelhardt "reveals the amazing individualism of the small farmer with complete ruthlessness and ... shows in detail that our peasants are the most extreme proprietors in matters of property, that the peasants have extremely developed individualism, egoism, striving for exploitation." It was Engelhardt who described how in

"large" Russian peasant families each woman washes only **her slice** of the table...

The NOTES of the Russian chemist Engelhardt date back to the last twenty years of the 19th century. And in the early thirties of the 20th century, already the Soviet physicist Sergei Frish, on his return from a scientific trip to Germany and Holland, observed in the region

native aspens very sad pictures, involuntarily comparing them with foreign ones...

Leningrad... Tram stop, not many people. A half-empty tram approaches, and a crush begins - everyone tries to get in first.

Frisch saw something else in Berlin... Rush hour. A bus comes to the stop, and the conductor from the back platform shows three fingers to the waiting line - they say, there are three empty seats. The first three calmly, without haste, enter the bus. Leningrad ... At the

kerosene shop, a young cart  
The guy rolls brand new metal barrels from the cart along the plank. One accidentally breaks out and hits a lamp post... There is a dent on the barrel... And now the rest of the barrels roll right onto the pole: the guy liked the roar, and he directs them there  
on purpose.

And here is Holland, the quiet town of Groningen ...  
The same shop, and also barrels on a cart. Carrier pulls out



under the goat a straw pillow and begins to carefully remove the barrels on it.

These are the conditions under which Stalin decided to make a "great change" not only in Russian agriculture, but also in national psychology! These are the "age-old foundations, customs, habits", dear to the hearts of the Gediminovichs, Princes Golitsyns, that had to be destroyed so that Russia could live.

Generations of Golitsyns, Bobrinskys, Romanovs instilled *such* "foundations" in generations of Russian peasants. After the reform of 1861, after the "liberation", millions of former serfs moved to the cities, taking with them the foundations, customs and habits. Good and ugly.

The cities of Ryabushinsky, Tereshchenko, Guzhonov and Brodsky crushed the good and encouraged the dark, while foolish... And

the "group of sadists" - by definition, the "purely" educated Prince Vladimir Golitsyn, that is, Stalin and the CPSU (b) - had to do the dirty work of clearing the ugly centuries-old layers in the Russian national character.

The village itself did not understand the need for this **for the village...** But Professor Engelhardt wrote long before the Stalinist collectivization:

"I consider the question of artel economy to be the most important question. Everyone who loves Russia, for whom its development, might, and strength are dear, must work in this direction..."

Stalin loved Russia, and her development, power and strength were dear to him. Therefore, he worked in *this* and many other directions - to ensure the future of Russia, no matter how difficult it was.

For a better understanding of Stalin's problems, it is necessary to understand, after all, this is what ... Holland, for example, has long been considered a classically prosperous

country. But for what? The industriousness and accuracy of the people? Yes, sure. But not only... The Dutch colony of Indonesia alone had six times the population of the metropolis. And in almost every not only urban, but even rural family there, "in India", as the Dutch said, there was someone who served in the grain positions of "white employees" on the plantations and sent home good money. From century to century. The

caps and aprons of the young Dutch women were immaculately clean, but if you looked through them into the light, you could see behind them not only the blue Flemish sky and pale pink clouds, but also rickety brown babies, flat, sagging breasts of their young mothers, blood and the sweat of their fathers.

Even great Dutch diligence would mean little without capital. But at the beginning of socialist reconstruction we did not have a capital  
la, no diligence. And

the socialist reconstruction was carried out in one, in fact, a decade - from 1930 to 1940! This is an absolutely short time compared to any other grandiose socio-economic transformation that has ever been undertaken anywhere in the world. Even the industrious Japanese, after their "conservative Meiji revolution" in 1867-1868, never had such a pace! Moreover, Russia made such a great breakthrough practically without attracting foreign capital and completely without exploiting foreign peoples.

To whom, apart from millions of its Ivanovs and Maries, does Russia owe this in the first place? There is only one honest answer: "Stalin!" At one time, Dan spoke of Lenin in the sense that it is impossible, they say, to resist a person who thinks about one thing twenty-four hours a day - about the socialist revolution. The same characterization is fully applicable to Stalin, with the only difference that twenty-four hours a day he was no longer thinking about the socialist revolution, but about socialist construction in the country that made this socialist revolution. The famous Socialist-Revolutionary Viktor Chernov in March 1924

published an article about Lenin in the émigré magazine Volya Rossii. While reading this article, I involuntarily noted three points for myself: the limitations of Chernov himself, the regularity of the political collapse of his party, and ... Lenin's lack of alternatives, as the only possible politician for Russia, capable of saving Russia at that turbulent time, and not destroying it. . And in the thirties, forties, fifties, Stalin already turned out to be such a non-alternative

politician, the only one capable of not destroying Russia, but strengthening and glorifying it.

CHERNOV wrote about Lenin, whom he knew well. However, what he wrote about Lenin was fully applicable to Stalin, whom Chernov almost never heard of.

knew:

"The happy integrity of his nature and a strong life instinct made him some kind of spiritual "Roly-Vstanka". After all the failures, blows of fate, defeats, he knew how to straighten up spiritually. Its in

the left temperament was like a steel spring, which "gives back" the more strongly it is pressed. He was a strong and robust political fighter, just the right kind to create and maintain uplifting spirits, and to prevent panic in case of failure, encouraging

by the power of personal example and the instillation of unlimited self-confidence, and that vat in moments of good luck, when it is so easy and so it is dangerous to turn into an "arrogant party" capable of resting on its laurels and foreseeing future dangers. He was

never a brilliant firework of words and images (what distinguished Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin. - S.K.). He was both clumsy and rude, he was often repeated. But in these repetitions, both in rudeness and in simplicity, there was a system and a strength of its own. A living, restless, strong-willed element made its way through the chewing, firmly marching towards the intended goal. He was willingly regarded as an ambitious

and power-hungry man; but he was only naturally, organically powerful, he could not help imposing his will, because he himself was charged with a "double charge" of it, and because it was as natural for him to subjugate others as it was natural for him to attract the central luminary into his own. orbit and make smaller planets revolve around themselves - and, as it is natural for them, to shine not with their own light, but with reflected light. A plebeian by habit and nature, he remained simple and natural in his life after the October celebrations, just as before.

True, Chernov was mistaken in defining Lenin as a "plebeian" ...

However, Lenin's former opponent clearly meant here only that there was no "refinement" in Lenin ... Even less can be considered "refined" - in a trivial sense of this word - Stalin. However, there was refinement - not coyly "secular", but spiritual refinement in the two great leaders of the Bolsheviks ... Neither Lenin nor Stalin were simple natures. Congenital aristocracy of spirit and thought as the highest form

naturalness in the complete absence of a pose - this is what shines through in every photograph of Lenin. But Stalin... Air Marshal Golovanov once recalled

an unusual dinner at Stalin's during the war... Churchill, a direct descendant of the Duke of Marlborough, sat at the table of the shoemaker's son. The Englishman began by pouring Armenian cognac into a large glass in front of Stalin. Stalin answered him in the same way, and...

"The toasts followed one after another," Golovanov recalled, "Stalin and Churchill drank on a par. I heard that Churchill was capable of drinking large quantities of hot drinks, but Stalin had no such ability. Will there be something? Churchill got drunk before his eyes, but nothing changed in Stalin's behavior. Apparently by

I showed my youth too frankly interest in the state of two politicians and was very worried about how it would all end. The meeting has come to an end. Everyone got up. Churchill left the room, supported by the arms. And I stood, as if spellbound, and looked at Stalin. Certainly,

he saw that I was watching him all the time. He came up to me and said: "Don't be afraid, I won't drink Russia away. But Churchill will rush about tomorrow when he is told that he has been talking here. And with a firm, unhurried gait you walked out of the room...

Churchill was a patrician by habit, but by nature he was just a plebeian, because he was, firstly, a spiritual slave of the "golden calf", and secondly, he was also a direct, hired servant of the "golden calf " .

minorities of humanity.

Stalin was simple in habits, but possessed that greatness that is given only to a noble soul serving a noble cause. What about Trotsky, Bukharin, Litvinov-

Wallah, Churchill, Roosevelt and dozens of other political figures who were Stalin's contemporaries?.. All of them had weaknesses, petty predilections,

passions. If not from each, then from every second paragraph of

the articles by the butterfly collector Bukharin came out: "Oh, how smart and witty **I am** ." Trotsky's refrain was different: "Oh, what a boss **I am** !"

Churchill: "What a far-sighted and impeccable I am ."

Roosevelt's stamped smile was supposed to convince him what kind of "boyfriend" he is ...

Stalin's behavior, Stalin's speeches, Stalin's texts said: "Here **we are**. Here are **our** tasks that's how **we** should solve them."

Tukhachevsky made violins. Touching? WHO Can...

Churchill, at his leisure, laid out the brick walls with his own hands and was even solemnly admitted to the masons' trade union.

Stalin, on the other hand, a practical social reformer with unique opportunities, had only one hobby, one passion - the strengthening of Russia, at the head of which he stood.

Stalin did not tolerate crows. But at his dacha there were many tame squirrels. Let's think about it, could you take your best friends from our smaller brothers? Dogs and even cats require parts of the soul for themselves.

But a politician who lives for the working people simply does not have the right to spend his spiritual strength on something other than the people themselves. Horses? This or the right of a born horse

ka, or whim of an aristocrat.

But a cute Russian little animal, I instantly sweep away bringing rubbish and fatigue from the soul with its red luxurious tail? What an accurate and

humane choice - a squirrel on Stalin's hand. Credulity itself is on the hand of someone who could appreciate this gullibility precisely because

that he knew very well the price of the right to trust.

Likewise, sometimes at the level of instinct, whether the masses trusted Stalin. Both party

and popular. Trotsky gravitated towards the party elite and, in general, towards the elite.

Stalin, on the other hand, came out of the people and acquired his party authority among the people.

Among the people, he is his, by the way, to this day and with kept - despite all the efforts of his enemies, that is, the enemies of Russia. In 1924, Viktor Chernov

admitted that "in the person of Lenin, the greatest character of the Russian revolution has descended into the grave." And so it was.

However, even then, in the person of Stalin, Russia had the second largest character, standing on the side of the working people. By

the beginning of the thirties, it became clear that now this was **the only** major character in Russia that met the requirements of the era of a steep Russian rise to the heights of power and prosperity.

And the course of history in Russia and in the world in the thirties and forties revealed this truth more and more clearly and on a larger scale ...

About STALIN as the first figure not only in Russian, but also in world history, I will say more. But Stalin is an amazingly multifaceted genius, and to describe his phenomenon in all its manifestations, thick and, oddly enough, still unwritten volumes are needed. Now a little about Stalin - advice to the leader

sky engineers...

Even such a hater of the new Russia as the émigré historian Georgy Fedotov, in his "snapshot of Russia" - by January 1, 1936, admitted through gritted teeth:

"...Stalin opened wide the door to life of practitioners-professionals...

Stalin's true support is that class, which he himself called "noble" people ... Party membership card and past servants mean little now; personal fitness ... - everything. This new ruling stratum includes... Chekists, commanders of the Red Army, the best engineers, technicians, scientists and artists of the country...

The new Soviet patriotism is a fact that is pointless to deny. This is the only chance for the existence of Russia ... "



This was written by the enemy! But even the enemy understood that a new, stable patriotism had already arisen in Soviet Russia. Now in Russia, the more a person was educated, the more he loved Russia. And the more he wanted and could do for her. This was Stalin's true

young guard! Although in the second half of the thirties many old specialists also entered the ranks of the intellectual guard of the Land of the Soviets, who more and more often called themselves non-party Bolsheviks. Some of them, like the old academician Paton, later became Bolsheviks by official party affiliation.

Stalin knew his scientific and technical guard very well, appreciated it, respected it, listened to it and supported it. But for this, after all, it was necessary to understand her problems! Including - in purely professional problems .

And formally, Stalin had only unfinished theological seminary.

Nevertheless, you will not find (that is, you will ***not find at all !***) memoirs of those who collaborated with Stalin for a long, businesslike manner (and often suffered a lot from him) and who would not speak of him with the deepest respect. Of course, this is not about Trotsky or Khrushchev, but about the organizers of the mentality, designers, military leaders, metallurgists, power engineers.

One of the little-known memoirists, the former Stalinist People's Commissar of Power Plants Zhimerin, graduated from the Moscow Power Engineering Institute in 1931. The peasant son, accustomed to work, mastered science well, which is why he was enrolled

to graduate school.

Soon, however, I had to deal with practical power engineering and eventually enter that circle of national economic leaders, which can be called "Stalin's Big Team" and which included hundreds of leaders of the economy known to Stalin personally - from people's commissars to directors of large enterprises.

Zhimerin's first meeting with Stalin was not one of the most successful - because of the overload of the Ural factories, a power supply crisis has set in there.

The young people's commissar was summoned to a meeting in a hundred Linsky cabinet, and there Stalin told him:

- They complain about you that in the Urals they turn off for water, it falls there ... - they suggested from the side: "often that one", - yes, the frequency drops. What is this, by the way?

Even such a question in such a situation and at such a level can only be asked by an absolutely natural person, devoid of posture and conceit!

Is not it?

Zhimerin explained what and why they say they have Xia purely technical reasons ... Stalin

was interested, of course, not in reasons, but the possibility of eliminating them, and he asked:

- What are you offering?

Zhimerin suggested a solution, and Stalin immediately got the point, which Zhimerin admired. He was also struck by the calm, thoughtful style of Stalin's business communication. And the first impression did not deceive the People's Commissar. For many years of communication, both in personal meetings and at meetings of the Politburo, Stalin was attentive and patient. He objected to

Zhimerin once, already after the war, in a dispute (!) over the construction of the Kremenchug hydroelectric power station in the Ukraine. Stalin, according to Zhimerin's recollection, then got up from the table, went up to the ryamtsu and asked him - on "you", which allowed both the difference in age and their long-standing acquaintance:

How long are you going to argue with me? This is the first... And the second - why don't you build small hydropower plants on the tributaries

of the Dnieper? - The shores are low, it is impossible to build stations there,

Comrade Stalin. -

Have you

been there? - I wasn't... - And I fought there. So go, look and then argue.

This is the electric power

industry ... But Stalin was well versed - at least within the framework of the competence necessary for the head of state - and in the problems of defense technical

nicknames.

Aircraft designers unanimously declare that he is you listened to them with full understanding of the matter.

But the designers of artillery weapons also assert this! And the designers

of tanks ... And ammunition ...

Stalin, during the

Soviet-Finnish war of 1939-1940, even found time - unlike the generals - to worry about the problem of field nutrition for fighters in difficult winter conditions, and thanks to him, industrial production was quickly established army concentrates. And Stalin personally - unlike the generals - checked how long it takes for a solid briquette

of millet concentrate to turn into hot porridge. Right in his office, in the very one in which the most important state meetings were held, he filled the briquette with water and spotted

time. It

should be noted that the topic, for example, of the comparative competence of the professional higher

The inadequacy of the Red Army and Stalin in matters of military-technical support of modern warfare is a separate and virtually unexplored topic, starting from the time long before the start of the Great Patriotic War.

For example, the initial terms of reference of the People's Commissariat of Defense of the USSR for the heavy tank SMK ("Sergey Mironovich Kirov") - the prototype of the later famous heavy tank KB ("Klim Voroshilov") - provided for a three-turret vari

ant.

The designers - they also understood something in the principles of the combat use of the equipment they developed - "quietly" worked out a single turret version, but the military did not understand

found.

Stalin, getting acquainted with new developments, rejected the awkward version of the three towers, and as a result a powerful single-turret tank with impenetrable armor was created. Moreover, in this case, Stalin thought like a real, qualified designer. During a discussion in his office between the designers and the military about insufficient armor, he took a turret with a 45-mm cannon from the model and asked: - How much does it weigh? - Two and a half tons. - So take it off, and spend the reserve weight on armor. And it was a purely engineering, not an organizational decision! There is no doubt that such thoughts came to the minds of the designers - after

all, they knew their business

perfectly. But if it weren't for Stalin's engineering way of thinking, they wouldn't

have proved their case before ordering

chiki in buttonholes.

Just as short-sightedly, the military refused the T-34 medium tank, and Stalin's role in the fate of this "steel knight" of the Great War was also decisive. There is also a story

about how Stalin strongly supported the young designer Grabin with his idea of a specialized divisional gun, while marshals, including Tukhachevsky, and generals almost unanimously insisted on some kind of "universal" gun, referring to information from American military magazines (The United States never created such a gun). And what about the situation with combat aviation that had developed

in the Red Army Air Force by 1937? Neither the chief engineer of the Main Directorate of the Aviation Industry of the USSR People's Commissariat of Heavy Engineering, aircraft designer Tupolev, nor the head of armaments of the Red Army, Marshal Tukhachevsky, provided the development of, for example, a single promising project of a modern fighter by this year! No one! But from the idea to mass serial

production

of military equipment usually takes at least four to five years! That is, if Tupolev still decided everything in the aviation industry, and Tukhachevsky and the head of the Air Force Alksnis were still in command in the Red Army, then Russia would meet the war not only with extremely outdated combat aircraft, but also without more or less modern design touched, which would quickly eliminate the failure! Nothing more and nothing less ... Only when Stalin got to the bottom of the situation, everything changed in a year or

two, and by the beginning

of the war, the Red Army Air Force was already armed with new fighters Yakovlev - "Yak", Lavochkin and Gorbunov with Gudko

vym - "LaGG", Mikoyan and Gurevich - "MiG", and during the war these young designers - in the full sense of the word, Stalin's *pupils* - gave new designs that ensured the Victory. Stalin, on the other hand, supported

the aircraft designer Ilya Shin with his "flying tank" "Il-2" - a thunderstorm for the Germans in future battles.

And Stalin was just as attentive to the designers of aircraft engines, mortars, small arms ... And not only before the war and during the war, but all the years after the war - until his death. After all, Stalin's erudition and competence in special issues of scientific and technological progress was constantly increasing, therefore he was more and more capable of making *engineering*-based government decisions.

YES, IN THE PRE-WAR years of the Stalin era, Soviet engineers, especially those of them who were at the forefront of engineering work - in design and design bureaus, in research institutes, had no more influential and interested in their work supporter than Stalin. He really was the leader of the leading Soviet engineers and designers, and at the same time brought up new cadres of project leaders.

thinking and economics.

The young people's commissars Tevosyan, Ustinov, Parshin, Vannikov, Malyshev and their other colleagues, their young deputies and chiefs of central departments—all of them knew Stalin, and Stalin knew all of them personally.

It was he who said: "Cadres decide everything"! And it was the prizes named after him that were awarded to the most talented and successful scientists and engineers in Russia. Of

necessity, Stalin paid more attention to the defense industries - in any case, this

the side of his leadership of scientific and technological progress in the USSR is best known. But in the prewar years, the most advanced engineering forces of Russia were necessarily concentrated in the defense industries, and, developing them, Stalin developed the entire scientific and technical potential of the state in general. However, even before the end of the war,

Stalin began to direct our "defensemen" towards grandiose peace projects. Thus, the Ural "Tankograd" was soon to become a powerful center for civilian heavy and transport engineering.

And

became. What has already been said about Stalin as a technical leader of the country, it may seem to someone almost a panegyric to him. But the above is only naked truth about his role and participation in the development of domestic science and technology. And besides, it is said - in order not to make the book heavier - and far, far from everything.

But it's impossible not to say a few more things... It's also impossible because, for example, in the Medvedev brothers' book Unknown Stalin it says: "Repressions among scientists, the death of important scientific schools, the advancement of careerists, fanatical dogmas, tricks or charlatans - this most often ended Stalin's interference in scientific discussions ... "Here, one can clearly see a hint of

Stalin's support for Trofim Denisovich Lysenko, proclaimed by the "democrats" "the greatest" quasi-scientist "of the world. There is no place in this book for a detailed analysis of the Lysenko phenomenon, however, a little information to reflect on the topic - is such a hopeless "charlatan" supported by the "ignorant" Stalin for many years - we, dear reader, are unlikely to

does it hurt...

Firstly, by 1925 - by the age of 27, "ignorant" Lysenko, he managed to graduate from the Poltava school gardener

stva, Kyiv two-year breeding courses and Kiev Agricultural Institute, worked at the same time, he became a real breeder and became the author of the early-ripening tomato variety Erlian-17 (later Lysenko gave a number of valuable varieties of various crops).

Secondly, only two modern Soviet breeders were awarded separate articles in the third and last edition of the TSB, and both are Lysenko's faithful comrades-in-arms and students, who for some reason did not renounce him until the end of their lives. I mean twice Hero of Socialist Labor Pavel Panteleimonovich Lukyanenko, author and co-author of 15 (fifteen!) zoned varieties of wheat (including the famous "Bestless I"), a member of the European Breeders' Association, a member of the Royal Academy of Agriculture and forestry and others, and others, as well as Vasily Nikolaevich Remeslo, Hero of Socialist Labor, author of wheat varieties Mironovskaya-808, Mironovskaya Yubileinaya and others. To these two associates of Lysenko, Russia owes its main grain fund, but

with what difficulty did the Khrushchev-Brezhnev Academy of Sciences of the USSR elect Lukyanenko only in 1964, and Craft even in 1974 as its full members ... Zhores Medvedev calls the Craft "unprincipled and an active supporter of Lysenko" and joyfully reports in his book about Lysenko that in 1964 the Biological Department voted for the Craft three times - and all three times he did not pass. But all the "advanced geneticists" of the USSR, neither by that time nor later, had given the country a single acceptable variety of any agricultural crop! For several decades, they actually destroyed the Russian practical selection, the former leader



who - Ivan Michurin - was once admired by the whole world ... Thirdly, Lysenko, like Michurin,

called for considering a living organism without separating it from the conditions of its development, and today a number of researchers have actually proved Lysenko right! By changing the conditions of life, in particular, feeding, the experimenters breed new types of animals - this is what Lysenko worked on! And they are bred not by the methods of genetic engineering, but by the methods of scientific selection - as Michurin, Lysenko, Lukyanenko, Remeslo did ...

As for the "advanced" genetic engineering, today in any supermarket, looking closely, the buyer can read the assurances of manufacturers of various products that for their production GM

components were not used.

"GM" is just "genetically modified cited", about which one can remember not a very good smelling, but accurate saying that "HM ..." there are no two varieties.

As, I note, by the way, the "democrats" ... Finally, I will tell the reader how I close whether an "anti-science" experimental program Lysenko in 1965. It began

with the fact that the journalist (!) Agranovsky from Literaturnaya Gazeta, who had no special education, came to inspect Lysenko's experimental base. After his article and a number of other articles in such "scientific" publications as "Komsomolskaya Pravda", the State Inspection Commission was formed, the results of which were considered on September 2, 1965 at a joint (!) meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the board of the Ministry agriculture of the USSR and the Presidium of VASKhNIL (V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences).

As a result, Lysenko as a scientist was destroyed. But who was a member of the high academic

## mission?

And here's who: one director of a non-core research institute, one provincial professor, two ordinary zoo technicians, one ordinary agronomist, two ordinary officials and - I was not mistaken, dear reader - one accountant . I'm not kidding - the composition of the commission is given in the book by Zhores

Medvedev "The Rise and Fall of Lysenko." The main public detractor T.D. Lysenko reports

it like this:

"The State Inspection Commission was created at the end of January (1965 - S.K.). Director of the Institute of Agricultural Economics VASKhNIL A.I. Tulupnikov. Naibo

more competent zootechnician in comis

This was the Kyiv professor NA Kravchenko. It included livestock specialists E.K. Guneeva, Yu.M. Krynkina, agronomist D.S. Lesik, accountant I.L. Popok and two employees of the apparatus of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences ... "

Even Medvedev himself - generally not known for bashfulness - bashfully admitted: "The composition of the mission committee was not representative enough ...

genetics, not an agrochemist was included in it, although, in essence, works on applied genetics were checked.

I don't know if I have given enough information so that the reader can at least *doubt* the validity of Lysenko's post-Stalin assessments, but, anyway, this is the topic of genetics

I'm done and I'll tell you something else...

After the war, Stalin had exceptionally many forces and paid attention to several scientific and technical problems that were then (as, indeed, now) of vital importance for Russia. First of all, this is the atomic problem. It is rightly considered that the fact that Russia so quickly eliminated the US atomic monopoly, and with it the threat of atomic destruction by American atomic bombs, the greatest personal merit belongs to Lavrenty Beria and Igor Kur

chat. And

it is. However,

there is no doubt that if both of them - the Curator and the Scientific Director of the Soviet Atomic Project - were asked who should be given priority here, they would, without saying a word, would name Stalin.

And it wouldn't be about flattery. No one knew as much about Soviet atomic work as Kurchatov and Beria did. Nobody, except for Stalin. In critical periods, he delved into even seemingly small details. At the same time, Stalin, of course, had no special

scientific knowledge in the field of nuclear physics...

I wrote this, but immediately thought: "Anyway, who can now say what Stalin knew and what he did not know, what was his true educational outlook?" In order to talk with the same Zhimerin, Stalin, when he saw the need for it, got acquainted with the basics of electrical engineering from a textbook for electricians. Therefore, he could also *read* some literature on atomic physics in order to understand something. Stalin, by the way, when he was informed about the accumulated plutonium for our first RDS-1 bomb, asked the physicists if it was possible from this

plutonium to make not one, but two bombs, but of lesser power?

Scientists then gave him a negative answer, referring to the "laws of nature", to which Stalin noted that the laws of nature, they say, are also not a dogma ...

Later, this Stalinist answer was cited by his detractors as proof of the alleged "limitedness" of the "tyrant", to whom even the laws of nature are not written. But Stalin was - among other things - also an outstanding philosopher-dialectic and only meant that people learn the laws of nature in a certain approximation, and what today is perceived as an immutable law, tomorrow may turn out to be only a particular case of a more general law.

And Stalin was right - the time has come, knowledge expanded, and from the amount of plutonium contained in RDS-1, it became possible to make not even two, but three or more bombs. Stalin was also

attentive to the missile problem, and the same was the case with questions of the development of jet aviation ... But Stalin

was also not formally interested in questions of radar and the development of radio electronics. And peaceful nuclear work

too. Finally, in this book - the last on the topic of Stalin as the leader of scientific and technological progress in Russia ... None other than Stalin, stood at the origins of the

creation of domestic electronic computing technology. That is, what is now called a computer

terami.

On July 9, 1952, a top secret Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, signed by Stalin, was issued, relating to the promising work of the "atomic" First Main Directorate under the Council of Ministers of the USSR. Annexes to this Decree

there was also a description of the first Soviet computer "Strela":

The "Strela" automatic high-speed machine is intended for the numerical solution of a wide range of mathematical problems. It is planned to carry out work related to the completion of the technical design of the machine, the manufacture, installation and adjustment of the machine in 1952, the delivery of the Strela machine to a special commission for the 2nd quarter of 1953.

When the first Russian computer - the second in the world and the first in Europe - began calculating the world's first hydrogen bomb RDS-bs, Stalin was no longer alive. However,

the fact that already in 1954 Russia could itself make atomic bombs that were very advanced for those times and calculate hydrogen bombs was also a direct merit of Stalin. And the "democrats"

today vilely assert that we are lagging behind the West in computer developments because the "tyrant" Stalin banned cybernetics as a "false science". Although the "father of cybernetics" Norbert Wiener in his memoirs named only one scientist who had been stepping on his heels all his life - Andrey Kolmogorov. And here is what the Soviet Encyclopedia reports

about him.

pedic dictionary" for 1954:

**"KOLMOGOROV** Andrey Nikolaevich (b. 1903), Soviet mathematician, academician, laureate of the Stalin Prize. K[olmogorov] owns research on the theory of probability and the theory of functions, as well as on topology, geometry and mathematical logic. Awarded 3 Orders of Lenin.

By the way, just in the era of Stalin, Soviet mathematics received such a powerful state backing that it lived on "interest" from Stalin's support almost until the very collapse of Russian science by Gorbachev, Yeltsin and the Yeltsin-headed Yeltsinoids ... But there is nothing to be surprised at - Stalin

supported science so powerfully because he himself was one of the most educated people of his time. There were more than 20 (twenty) thousand books in his working library. And almost all of them bore traces of his work - marks, cross-outs, etc. This is not Tsar Nicholas the Bloody, who took up reading seriously

only after his abdication and arrest, and not the current illiterate "presidents".

POSSIBLE, and today in the state archives reliable documents about the last pre-war week are stored seven times seven times, but hardly ... If, according to the testimony, for example, of Chekist generals Sudoplatov and Dokuchaev, in the time of Khrushchev, trucks of documents were destroyed - obviously less explosive than these few leaves, then the folder with them was destroyed by Khrushchev after the death of Stalin in the first place. After all, their truth was dangerous not only for

Khrushchev, but also for the entire leadership of that time.

Moreover, for the top generals, the truth of these documents was even more deadly than for the civilian "top" of the elite. I have in mind the fundamental documents relating to Stalin's **advance** authorization to put the troops on alert and to his actions during the last pre-war week. However, over time, they appear - let

and scattered, but developing into a certain goal

a new picture - new information, and old data and documents receive a new interpretation. And a lot

can be rethought and seen in its true light. Who "blundered" the war -

Stalin or the general? Who is to blame for the failure of the Red Army in the first

days of the war - Stalin or those top military leaders who, even in the spring of 1941, did not really prepare for the war, and in May 1941 let a German plane pass to Moscow just as mediocrely as much later did their successors miss Rust's plane to Moscow? Did all Soviet troops meet the war in beds, and not in the trenches? Why did the commander of the Western Special Military District, Pavlov, spend the last pre-war evening in the theater, and why did Deputy People's

Commissar of Internal Affairs Lavrenty Beria, head of the USSR border troops, Sokolov, spend

the last pre-war evening at the western border? Why were two pre-war orders of the people's commissars of defense Voroshilov and Timoshenko about the camouflage of airfields and military equipment not carried out? And why was the fact that Stalin, almost a week before the start of the war, offered Hitler to urgently send

Molotov to Berlin, to which the Fuhrer refused, was hushed up in the USSR for decades, as is also hushed up in Rossyannin? To these and many other pressing questions today

answers can be given, and there is every reason to assert expect that the responsibility for the tragic start of the war lies not with Stalin, but with the then top generals. First of all - on the chief of the General Staff Zhukov, the commander of the Western Special Military District Pavlov, People's Commissar Timoshenko and a number of commanders of formations in the border districts and military branches in Moscow.

This is confirmed by many documents and thoughtful analysis of memoirs and other sources. We can say this: Stalin was not blind, but carefully monitored the situation in real time. He thoughtfully analyzed the information of the foreign strategic intelligence, which from February 3, 1941, was subordinate not to the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs, Beria, but to the People's Commissar of the new People's Commissariat of State Security, Merkulov. Stalin reasonably questioned (but did not reject!) Merkulov's data. On the other hand, he had extensive reliable information from the intelligence of the border troops subordinate to

Beria. And on the eve of the last pre-war week, Stalin conducted a series of personal soundings of the situation (including with the help of Beria and Merkulov). Finally, Stalin was informed about the imminent start of the war by Hitler personally, refusing to accept Molotov for urgent consultations. Therefore, Stalin authorized

in time to bring the Red Army and the Red Army Fleet into combat readiness. And already on June 19, 1941, the directorates of the western military districts began to deploy into the directorates of the fronts. The headquarters of the Kiev Special Military District moved to Ternopil to the command post of the South-Western Front, the headquarters of the Western Special Military District to the command post of the Western Front in the Baranovichi region, the task force of the headquarters of the Odessa Military District to Tiraspol to the command post of the

I will cite just one fact out of many suggestive... Just before the war, ND Marshal of Artillery Yakovlev was appointed head of the Main Artillery Directorate from the post of artillery commander of the Kyiv OBO. And this is how he described the situation in his memoirs, published long after the end of

wars:



"By June 19, I had already completed the handover of affairs to my successor and almost on the go said goodbye to my now former colleagues. On the move, because the headquarters of the district and its departments these days just received an order to relocate to Ternopil and hastily curtailed work in Kyiv.

The testimony of Yakovlev does not disagree with the data of the book by G. Andreev and I. Vakurov "General Kirponos", published by Politizdat of Ukraine in 1976:

"... in the afternoon of June 19, the People's Commissar of Defense ordered the field department of the district headquarters to relocate to the city of Ternopil."

So, not on June 22, but at least on June 19, 1941, the headquarters of the frontier special — Kiev and Western — military districts began to move! But why did this **district** administration

suddenly rush to Ternopil, where **the front-line** command post was supposed to be located in the building of the former headquarters of the 44th Infantry Division ? We are told that the "tyrant" and "fool" Stalin did not allow Pavlov, commander of the ZAPOVO, to withdraw troops to summer camps, although there was no crime in that - planned combat training. And here the headquarters of the Western Special Military

District and the Kiev Special Military District are removed from their places! Who could give instructions about

this, if not Stalin? Stalin really gave all the necessary

instructions on time - not a few hours, but several **days** before June 22, 1941! But the top

generals in one way or another failed the most important pre-war measures

the last week, and the whole pre-war year was preparing for them not in the best way. The only one who

turned out to be completely ready for war was Beria and his border troops. The heroism of the border guards in the first weeks of the war largely saved the country, but this massive feat was also subsequently silenced, because it emphasized Beria's competence, which was especially striking against the backdrop of the incompetence of the army command.

This truth about the beginning of the war is so inconvenient that later it was tightly silenced by everyone whom it threatened with a loss of reputation. And she threatened everyone with this, except for Stalin, who was already dead. And everything was blamed on Stalin.

However, it was not he who "blundered" the beginning of the war.

But Stalin, at the head of the people Ivanov and Mariy, ensured the victorious end of this war, which was completed by the Victory Parade on Red Square on June 25, 1945. Even before that, at a reception in the

Kremlin in honor of the commanders of the Red Army, Stalin proclaimed this - the last at this reception - toast:

"... I would like to raise a toast to the health of our Soviet people and, above all, Russian people.

I drink, first of all, to the health of the Russian people, because they are the most outstanding nation of all the nations that make up the Soviet Union. I raise a toast to the health of the Russian people because

in this war they have not earned general recognition as the leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country.

I raise a toast to the health of the Russian people, not only because they are the leading people, but also because they have a clear mind, a steadfast character and patience ...

In these words there was not only respect, but also those Raft - sincere, genuine warmth of feelings of the father in relation to the sons and daughters who justified his best hopes ... And Stalin continued:

"Our Government made many mistakes, we had moments of desperate situation in 1941-1942, when our army retreated, left our native villages and cities of Ukraine, Belarus, Moldavia, the Leningrad region, the Baltic states, the Karelian-Finnish Republic, left because that there was no other way out... But the Russian people... believed in the correctness of the policy of their Government and

made sacrifices to ensure the defeat of Germany. And this confidence of the Russian people in the Soviet Government turned out to be the decisive force that ensured the historic victory ... Thanks to him, the Russian people, for the

rie.

For the health of the Russian people!"

Perhaps this is the most outstanding speech in the history of Russia, delivered by its leader to the glory of the Russian people! And this is natural - never before Stalin, except for the first "Leninist" years in the history of Russia, the people of Russia and its leader were in such close and fruitful unity!

Saying "Russia", many then meant Stalin. And saying "Stalin",

many then meant Russia.

STALIN and the Russian people... A separate book could be written on this subject alone. Even before Stalin, the Russian people had leaders who provided correct leadership of the Russian people, and the Russian people, under their correct leadership, had outstanding, historic successes ... But never - neither before nor after - did the Russian people have such some grandiose, incredible for outside observers successes and accomplishments, which he had under the leadership of Stalin. Yes,

Russian history is rich in bright names of truly national leaders, starting with the epic, but quite real Vladimir Yasna Solnyshko...

Yaroslav Vladimirovich the Wise, the son of St. Vladimir Svyatoslavich, at the beginning of the 11th century, when Europe was going through a period of complete fragmentation, created a centralized Russian state that united the Russian Slavs from the Carpathians to the Volga and the White Sea. And this was a union mainly not by a sword, but by an idea. It was a common bathroom on the similarity of views on the world and human life in this world. Under Yaroslav, he created the first variant of the Slavic code of laws with the indicative name "Russian Truth" ... The son of

Yaroslav - Vsevolod Yaroslavich, having received Pereyasavl South, lands along the Volga, Rostov the Great, Suzdal and Beloozero, upon the death of his father, the prince lived first in Chernigov, then became the Grand Duke of Kiev and was one of the most educated men of his time...

Yaroslav's grandson, the Grand Duke of Kiev, Vladi Mir Monomakh, a prince at first also in Chernigov, was called to reign in Kiev in 1113, eased the position of the "lower classes" and defeated the Polovtsy - he won because he again united the Russian principalities that were beginning to disintegrate into a single state .

This has become a "litmus test" of Russian history for all time - up to our Yeltsinoid times: when within the Russian geopolity

separatism and strife triumphed in the temporal space, the very existence of Rus' was threatened. As soon as the Russian people took up their minds and united, there were no fortresses that they could not take, there were no tasks that they could not solve! After the death of Monomakh, the Vladimir-Suzdal Principality began

to rise, reaching its greatest power under Vsevolod Yuryevich - Vsevolod the Big Nest ... However, soon after his death, which followed in 1212, the Big Russian "nest", in which Moscow was already located, turned out to be brutally devastated by the first invasion of the steppe hordes by Batu Khan in 1236. Vladimir and Moscow were followed by Kyiv's turn - this was the price of disengagement and

strife between the two historical centers of Rus

slavic...

United, highly civilized - for those times - Rus' could respond to the challenge of the Wild Steppe. Separated, for three

hundred years she fell under the ruthless boot, under the predatory Mongol yoke. The struggle began not for the development of Rus', but for its preservation as an original phenomenon - at least in the Russian North ... Already in 1240, the Novgorod prince Alexander Yaroslavich Nevsky defeated

Swedes near the Neva, and on April 5, 1242, at the head of the Russian soldiers, he stopped the Livonian Order in his moving east, lowering the international Livonian army under the ice of Lake Peipsi.

Nevsky was then only 22 (twenty-two) years old!

Becoming the Grand Duke of Vladimir ten years later, Alexander Yaroslavich Nevsky gave the first impetus to the new gathering of Rus' in the second half of the 13th century. In

the first half of the 14th century, the first of the Russian supreme leaders, symbolically named Ivan - Ivan I Danilovich, nicknamed Kalita ("Kalita" - a money bag), united under the hand of Vladimir and Moscow many Russian lands.

Kalita died in 1340, and on September 8, 1380, the Grand Duke of Vladimir Dimitri Ivanovich Donskoy, the grandson of Ivan Kalita, defeated Ma May's troops on the Kulikovo field.

Dimitry laid not only the foundation of the stone Moscow Kremlin, but also the foundation of the future liberation of Russia, the growth of its power and its limits. Donskoy's grandson, Vasily II Vasilyevich Tyomny, also an outstanding collector of Rus', was treacherously blinded by his cousin, the Galich appanage prince Dimitry Shemyaka, but, supported by the Moscow townsmen, took over him. Then - not yet degenerated

into the "electorate" - the Russian people understood who Rus' needed - its destroyers or its collectors.

The son of Vasily the Dark - Ivan III Vasilyevich - completed the task of a new initial centralization of the Russian lands and their unification around Moscow. In 1480, he even formally renounced tributary to the Mongols, and in fact, with his great reign, a new free and united Rus' begins, lost by us after Yaroslav the Wise.

Ivan IV Vasilyevich the Terrible was the first - in 1547, at the age of seventeen, to call himself "the king of all Rus'" and, in fact, peacefully expanded the borders of Rus' to Siberia and beyond. Having said "peacefully", I am not misleading the reader - the capture of Kazan and Astrakhan was not accompanied by the beating and humiliation of the vanquished, but marked the beginning of a new community of peoples of the expanding and strengthening Russia.

Grozny was a truly great sovereign... Relying on "black", ordinary people and the service nobility, he severely suppressed the separatist and pro-Polish sentiments of the then elite - the boyars, carried out successful zemstvo, military, judicial reforms and created new ones, according to those at times, advanced forms of state administration through "sectoral left" - in modern parlance - orders.

Western and current "Russian" historians blame him with paranoia, as they did with Stalin, and with "bloody" "reprisals" against the "innocent" - just like they did with Stalin.

Terrible really had not the best nerves... But, firstly, I would like to look at his detractors - what a nervous constitution they would have if, in front of their eyes (and you are three years old!) Boyars brutally killed people close to them !

Secondly, a scrupulous calculation - on the strict orders of the Terrible himself - of all those killed on the orders of Ivan during his reign did not give even five thousand people over the many years of the turbulent life of the

state. And the clerks considered it zealously - they had to pray for those included in the martyrology, apologizing for the

sovereign's sins! In those same years, only in Paris, during the Bartholomew night, Catholics killed thirty thousand Huguenots indiscriminately, including women, the elder

and babies. The massacre of the Huguenots only weakened France and renewed the civil war. Ivan,

however, was driven by - albeit not always correctly understood by him - state necessity, and his

the era is characterized not by executions, but by a comprehensive sozi a gift from the state.

After more than a hundred years, the era of Peter came - "Tsar-worker".

It is interesting how Stalin compared the figures of Grozny, Peter and a number of their successors. On February 26, 1947, he, Molotov and Zhdanov had a long conversation with the director of the film "Ivan the Terrible" Sergei Eisenstein and actor Nikolai Cherkasov, who played the role of Ivan, about the film that had just been completed. Here is part of this

conversation, recorded with the words Hey Zenshtein and Cherkasov:

"Stalin. Have you studied history?

Eisenstein. More or less... Stalin. More

or less?... I'm not too familiar with history

either... Your oprichnina is shown incorrectly.

Oprichnina is the royal army. In contrast to the feudal army, which could at any moment fold its banners and leave the war, a regular army was formed,

progressive army...

Your king turned out to be indecisive, similar to Hamlet. Everyone tells him what to do, but he does not make decisions himself ... Tsar Ivan was a great and wise ruler, and if you compare him with Louis XI (you have read about Louis XI, who prepared



absolutism for Louis XIV?), then Ivan the Terrible in relation to Louis in the tenth heaven. The wisdom of Ivan the Terrible was that he stood on the national point of view and did not allow foreigners into his country. cal, protecting the country from the penetration of foreign influence... Peter I is also a great sovereign, but he was too liberal towards foreigners, opened the gates too much and allowed foreign influence into the country, allowing the Germanization of Russia...»

Then, among other things, Stalin added:

“Ekaterina allowed him even more (Germanization. - S.K.) , and further. Was the court of Alexander I a Russian court? Was the court of Nicholas I a Russian court? No, these were German courts. A

remarkable event of Ivan the Terrible was that he was the first to introduce the state monopoly of foreign trade. Ivan the Terrible was the first to introduce it, Lenin was the second ... ”

Stalin was, of course, right. In the pre-revolutionary history of the Russian state, after it was declared autocratic in the era of Ivan the Terrible, there were only two unconditionally great national leaders - the Terrible himself and Peter.

This is also why there are many vile myths about Peter—as well as about Ivan the Terrible, about Stalin—that portray the clever Peter as almost a neurasthenic and an alcoholic, now and then guided by an impulse, and not by state calculation...

But here in front of me is only one, taken almost at random, volume 12 (issue 2) of the academic edition of Letters and Papers of Emperor Peter the Great. This volume was published in 1977 in a meager - by Soviet standards - edition of 6300 copies, and it contains Peter's papers and his business correspondence from just the period from July to December 1712! Documents numbered from 5329 to 5794. Total - 465 documents in just six months.

And this is only a part of what was preserved from what was recorded on paper. And after all, only the most important things were recorded from the daily flow of affairs!

Dozens of addressees, hundreds of names and geographical names... In the subject index -

more than two thousand subjects of Peter's attention... I will cite here, of course

Indeed, only something, also taken at random, is that which plucked out an eye...

So, "The Naval Academy, barns, arithmetic, ah-terpost, boatswain's work, ramparts, felt, wax, Vyshnevolotsk water system, midshipmen, nails, general feldzeugmeisters, borders, trees (chestnuts, cedars, lindens, etc. .), children of the nobility, deserters, salaries in the army, brick, horse, cannon foundries, gunpowder, cloth and other factories, cab drivers in the army, the Spanish monarchy, canats, clerks, a map of the Smolensk district, kirgi

PS, cereals for the army, infirmaries, timpani, horses, foragers, navigators, tents in the army, stove-makers, pontoons, pork fat, the Sandomierz Confederation, Russia's allies, the Teutonic Order, trade with Venice, Finns, frigates, trenches ... ..

And so - up to the last: "... anchors, janissaries, the Treaty of Yaroslavl, barley, yachts." Did Peter have time for "drunken sprees" and everyday "debauchery"?

Here are his only outgoing papers only for the first half of November 1712: - a patent for the

admission to the Russian service of G.V. Leib

nitsa dated November 1 and a letter to him dated November 12;

- letters to the Danish king Frederick IV dated 4 and 12 November;

- Letters to the Polish King August II dated November 4, 8, 11, 12 and

14; - a letter to the Prussian king Frederick I dated

November 8; - Letters from AD Menshikov dated November 4, 7, 9, 12 and 14; - letters from P.P. Shafirov

on November 4 and 7; - letters from P.P. Shafirov, M.B.

Sheremetev

on November 4 and 7; - letter from B.I. Kurakin for Dutch merchants of November 7 and a general letter of credit to him of November 7, as well

as a letter of November 8; - letters of R.-H. Bour

on November 8-9 and November 13; -

letter from I.B. Lvov on November 10; -

letter to V.N. Zotov on November 11; - a letter to the Hanoverian elector

Georg Ludwig dated November 12; - a letter to the Duke of Wolfenbüttel Anton

Ulrich dated November 12; - "abshid" to the Russian ambassador in Vienna, Baron I.Kh. Urbihu dated November 13 and letters of recall

to him to Emperor Charles VI; - credentials and instructions for the trip to Vienna to the Russian ambassador in Holland A.A. Matveev ... But there were also letters received by the tsar - after all, they also had to be worked with, with make decisions on them...

On November 14, Peter writes to the shipmaster Fedosey Sklyaev:

*"I have tea that the shnava and barkgoats are already rounded, so is the deck with this watch*

*etza. And when you do this, then the side and cannon windows, as well as over the cabin of the semi-badge and tackboard, do not do it before me ... ” etc.*

And on the same day he orders another shipmaster, the Englishman Richard Browne:

*“If you haven’t strengthened the upper deck yet , then let it go back and lower, so that the commanding officer can use the hut instead of the cabin ... ” , etc.*

On November 17, Pyotr, with a courier, the dragoon of the Ustyug Regiment, Skryabin, informs Menshikov from Berlin *that “I came here just in time and I won’t linger for more than three days,”* and on the same day he informs *“friend Katerinushka” ... not spree - that is*

the meaning of the daily life of Peter and his associates. But how vilely slandered in their own country are its great workers — Pyotr, Arakcheev, Beria... How vilely slandered are Lenin. And how vilely slandered Stalin.

LENIN was always Stalin's teacher. Stalin constantly emphasized this publicly, but he believed so within himself. However, it is rightly said: “Master! Educate a student so that there is someone to learn from ... ” I think if Lenin could get acquainted with Stalin's state work for the almost forty years that Stalin stood at the head of Russia without Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich would understand and approve of all the main political and administrative decisions of Stalin. Yes, and, presumably, he would have recognized that the student turned out to be worthy of the teacher, and even surpassed him in the results of work on the strengthening and development of Russia ...

Even Lenin would have something to learn from Stalin in the matter of building a new great Russia.

It is precisely this last circumstance that makes it possible to put Stalin in the first place in the history of Russia, next to Lenin. And even give primacy to him, Lenin's disciple. Lenin could lead Russia

into the second great power in the world with excellent prospects for

the first place not only in the whole range of traditional indicators, but most importantly, in the unquestionably leading moral influence in the world. Lenin,

had he lived another twenty years, could have provided Russia with not arrogant, but comradely leadership in the world - as the first among equals. Lenin could...

Stalin ***could***.

And it's not

Stalin's fault that post-Stalinist Russia not only did not *fully* support these efforts of his

*ronim*, including moral, development, but also allowed the enemies of Russia to devalue and slander them. Lenin and Stalin... Stalin

and Lenin...

Lenin said: "Only that revolution of something Yes, it stands, which knows how to defend

itself ... "Stalin created both a powerful scientific, technical and industrial base for the defense of the socialist Fatherland, and a direct instrument of this defense - the nuclear missile Soviet Army.

Lenin set the task: "to learn to work" ... He knew that we "have material and are rich in natural resources, and in the reserve of human strength, and in the wonderful scope that the great revolution gave to folk art" in order to "create a truly powerful and abundant Russia"...

At the same time, Lenin declared that "we do not need hysterical impulses," and called for "work tirelessly on creating discipline and self-discipline." line, organization, order, efficiency, harmonious cooperation of the forces of the whole people ... ".

And Stalin solved the problem of educating the new Russian man so brilliantly that the German General von Mellenthin was forced to admit that "the skillful and persistent work of the Communists led to the fact that since 1917 Russia has changed in the most amazing way", that "the Russian has more and more the skill of independent action is developing, and the level of his education is constantly growing ... ".

Lenin gave Russia the slogan: "Study, study and study..."

But Stalin realized it by creating the world's best system of both public and higher education. And, as a truly great disciple of Lenin, he developed Lenin's thought in his last outstanding work, in *The Economic Problems of Socialism*:

"It is necessary to achieve such a cultural growth of society that would ensure to all members of society the comprehensive development of their physical and mental abilities, so that members of society have the opportunity to receive an education sufficient to become active agents of social development ..."

In other words, Stalin considered the education of the masses to be the main "nerve" of social life. Stalin saw in the education of the people not just a means of ensuring its economic flowering, but above all a means of creating an intellectually and socially active society!

After all, not only, and *not so much* for that, a person comes into the world to eat a certain number of cutlets or even pineapples with hazel grouse and truffles. A man worthy of being called

a man, having received education and freedom, should not live in order to eat, but eat in order to live - to live smartly and cheerfully! To live, developing in such a way that from this life becomes better and better not only for him, but also

for those around

you. A society consisting of such people would be a nightmare for any bureaucrat, for every bossy petty fool and tyrant! And it would very quickly outlive them, get rid of them - without repressions, but simply by throwing them out - by the ear, and into the sun - to the sidelines of public life. This is how Stalin saw the future socialist Russia. And

he wrote:

"It would be wrong to think that such a serious cultural growth of the members of society can be achieved without serious changes in the present state of labor. ***To do this, it is necessary first of all to reduce the working day to at least 6, and then to 5 hours*** (emphasis mine. - S.K.). This is to ensure that the members of the society have enough free time to receive a comprehensive education. To this end, it is necessary to further introduce compulsory polytechnic education, which is necessary to ensure that members of society have the

opportunity to freely choose a profession and not be chained for life to one particular profession.

To this end, it is necessary to further radically improve housing conditions and raise the real wages of workers and employees by at least twice, if not more, both through a direct increase in money wages and, especially, through further systematic of the decline in the prices of consumer goods”.

I invite the reader to read these lines again and think about this... Stalin was not a

theoretician-publicist, he was a real, practical head of a mighty state with enormous social weight. And if he wrote about the need for a transition in the future to a five-hour working day, then this was not a good wish of a dreamer, but a promising task for society. State directive for the future! Stalin's Russia was supposed to become - in his mind - a

country where fundamental education would be the guarantee of true freedom...

And labor is not the hype of the Stock Exchange, but Labor will be a guarantee of the sustainable prosperity of everyone engaged in productive labor for the benefit of the general public. stva.

At the same time, Stalin turned out to be **the only** head of state in world history who **practically** set ambitious social tasks, the condition, and not the consequence, of the fulfillment of which was a five (!) hour working day! And Stalin

understood perfectly well that “it is necessary to go through a series of stages of economic **and cultural re-education** of society, during which labor will be transformed from a means of only maintaining life **in the eyes of society** (singling out everywhere



my. - S.K.) into the first vital need, and public property - into the unshakable and inviolable basis of the existence of society ... Let us note - Stalin did not speak about coercion of society, but about its re-education! Only a great humanist could say that. But Stalin was him!.. Moreover, he was, perhaps, the most outstanding

**practical** humanist in the history of the world, asserting the rights of humanism in the world in the most significant way - the sovereign cause of building Russia as the Power of Good. Yes, Stalin turned out to be the greatest **practical** humanist in world history because

he laid the foundations of the only real society humane in its essence. And it is not his fault that Russia and the outside world did not appreciate the potential of world historical development, which was laid down by the works of Stalin.

At a reception in the Kremlin in honor of the participants in the Victory Parade on June 25, 1945, Stalin made a toast ... I will quote it here in full - from point to point:

"Don't think I'm going to say anything out of the ordinary. I have the simplest, most ordinary toast. I would

like to drink to the health of the people which ranks are few and the title is unenviable. For people who are considered "cogs" of the state mechanism, but without whom we are all marshals and commanders of fronts and armies, to put it bluntly, we are not worth a damn thing. Any "screw" went wrong - and over.

I raise a toast to simple, ordinary, modest people, to the "cogs" that hold

our great state mechanism is in a state of activity in all branches of science, economy and military affairs. There are a lot of them, their name is legion, because they are tens of millions of people. These are humble people. No one writes anything about them, they have no title, few ranks, but these are the people who hold us like the foundation holds the top.

I drink to the health of these people, our respected comrades!"

I brought this Stalinist toast in full, then  
mu that the "democrats" for many years, pulling out of him  
one word - "cog", they say that ordinary people were just "cogs" for Stalin,  
why  
he de and "did not spare" them.

Well, now the reader can decide for himself -  
how much truth there is...

Incidentally, the very "cogs" of the Derzhava's mechanism have  
always understood their significance... The old Bolshevik Skvirsky, a former  
worker, in his memoirs described an incident from the life of a factory  
before the revolution. A steam locomotive was built at the plant - a serious  
event for Russia, and the director arranged a solemn departure for it.

The "society" gathered, and the workers unscrewed a  
small piece ahead of time - a "screw". And -  
that's all ...

The locomotive - not moving, the director is knocked out of  
strength, the guests are perplexed, and in the downcast eyes of the  
workers there is  
laughter...

lochs."

But the meaning of Stalin's toast was multi-layered. The toast not only  
showed his own understanding

Stalin reminded the brilliant marshals, generals, people's commissars, factory directors and chief designers gathered in the Kremlin hall that they should not forget - the general

ly are strong soldiers.

The author of Vasily Terkin, the poet Tvardovsky, aptly quipped, writing: "The cities are surrendered by soldiers, the generals are taking them ..." However, Stalin - a soldier himself by his spirit - knew very well that everything was the other way around. Cities were taken by ordinary soldiers ... Those who went into battle for their homeland and for Stalin! For the Motherland! And for Stalin too!

STALIN was a natural patriot of Russia... He did not often reveal this quality in private conversations, preferring to glorify Russia by deed rather than by word. But in the case when the Word was Delo, he always found precise and effective words to awaken the Russian national feeling. So, in his speech on Red Square at the parade of the troops of the Moscow garrison on November 7, 1941, he called on the Russian people and all other peoples of Russia:

"... Let the courageous image of our great ancestors - Alexander Nevsky, Dmitry Donskoy, Kuzma Minin, Dmitry Pozharsky, Alexander Suvorov, Mikhail Kutuzov inspire you in this war! May the victorious banner of the great Lenin overshadow you!

Slanderers against Stalin claim that he turned to the great names of Russian history only in

these difficult days of 1941, playing, they say, on the national feelings of the people.

But this is another lie! Sergei Eisenstein's film "Alexander Nevsky" was filmed in 1938... About Alexander Nevsky, Dimitry Donskoy, Ivan Kalita, Ivan the Terrible, Peter, Suvorov, Kutuzov as great Russian names, Stalin spoke to Alexander Kollontai in November 1939.. And in the conversation I mentioned above with Eisenstein and Cherkasov about the film Ivan the Terrible, Stalin recalled events that took place long before the war.

uh, here's what:

“... When we moved the monument to Minin and Pozharsky closer to St. Basil's Cathedral, Demyan Bedny protested and wrote that the monument should be abandoned altogether and that Minin and Pozharsky should be completely forgotten. In response to this letter, I called him "Ivan, who does not remember kinship." We cannot throw away history...”

And here are some of the full-length films that were to be released in 1939, 1940 and 1941 according to the decision of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks of November 4, 1939: "The Tale of Ivan the Peasant's Son and Vasilisa the Beautiful", "Friendship" (Tbilisi Film Studio), Fires of Colchis, Siberians , David of Sasun, Suvorov, Georgy Saakadze , Sabuhi (about Azerbaijani democrat educator Mirza Fatali Akhundov), Lermontov, Mayakovsky , "Valery Chkalov", "Taras Bulba", "1812", "Chernyshevsky", "Ker-Ogly" ... As you can see, even before the war,

Stalin took care of making films about Russia, about the great Russian patriots, as well as and about the national heroes of other peoples of the USSR, thereby making these heroes the subject

volume of national pride of all Soviet people.

The "Russian" theme was expressed especially powerfully in a series of biopics after the war! And the merit in this is, first of all, Stalin. This was his direct position: to show Russia its true heroes, the heroes of thought and creative activity, by means of mass art itself.

In November 1952, with his blue pencil, Stalin made the last corrections to the draft Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU on measures to increase the production of feature films in the Union republics. And at the same time, for the last time, he approved the list of feature films that were to be either completely shot in 1953, or started in the last year of Stalin's life with production. Most of these films, designed to instill national pride, were never

made after Stalin's death - which speaks for itself, if you know that among them there should have been new films by I. Pyryev about Ivan the Terrible, V. Petrov about Dimitri Donskoy, A. Ivanov about Alexander Nevsky, I. Pudovkin about Peter the Great, M. Romm about the confrontation between Kutuzov and Napoleon, G. Alexandrov about Tchaikovsky and A. Stolper about Krum

com...

Khrushchev's "Russia", preparing for the "thaw", was no longer interested in the great history of great Russia. But Stalin's

Russia became more and more interested in its history, and one of the proofs of this was a wonderful book, about which I cannot but say at least briefly.

In 1947, the publishing house "Young Guard" published the book by Lev Gumilevsky "Russian

engineers." The 57-year-old author (he died in 1976 at the age of 86) was not an engineer. He was a writer who at the end of the twenties, at the invitation of Gorky, took part in the work on books from the series "The Life of Remarkable People", but since then he has taken up the history of science and technology in earnest. The preface to the

book was written by the Hero of Social Labor, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician I.P. Bardin, and it began like this:

"The book "Russian Engineers" by L. Gumilevsky, offered to the Soviet youth, is devoted to a very important and now more than ever relevant topic about the high dignity of Russian scientific and technical thought, about the bold creative initiative in engineering, which is so inherent in the figures of Russian technology. past and present  
weap ... ".

Academician Bardin further wrote:

"Workers of Russian science often had to work in difficult conditions: they had to fight for their cause against the bureaucratic indifference of tsarist officials, against the inertia of the ruling classes of Russia..."

And Ivan Pavlovich Bardin knew what he was writing. Born in 1883, he first studied at the Novo-Aleksandria Agricultural Institute, but in 1910 he graduated from the Kiev Polytechnic Institute in the chemical department. And then for two years he worked as a worker in factories in Chicago, in a country, as he later recalled, of "expensive cars and cheap human lives" ...

Returning to his homeland in 1911, he quickly took a prominent position in the metallurgy of the South of Russia, and after the revolution he immediately took the side of the Soviet government, from 1929 he supervised the construction of the Kuznetsk Metallurgical Plant, in 1932 he was elected an academician, led the Ural branch of the Academy of

Sciences THE USSR. Bardeen could competently compare working conditions in old Russia, in the USA and in new Russia, and he finished his preface to the book by L.I. Gumilevsky in the following words:

"Today, during the years of the fourth Stalinist five-year plan, the need for a number of measures to raise the engineering and technical culture in our country to an even higher level is beyond doubt. We should welcome everything that can

help us in this good deed ... "

Gumilevsky, in the author's preface, wrote:

"The Great October Revolution, the victory of socialism in our country raised high in the Soviet people a sense of national self-consciousness, national pride.

In our time, historical justice is being restored. We Soviet people, the heirs of the best that the culture of the Russian people has given us, speak about it the truth, which for many years has been distorted and trampled upon to please the ruling classes of old Russia, who bowed before everything foreign... This is servility and connected with his disbelief in the creative forces of the people reflected the economic dependence of tsarist Russia on the capitalists of the West...

Developing under... conditions... of foreign dominance, reactionary autocracy and economic backwardness, Russian science and technology made a huge, often decisive contribution to the treasury of knowledge of all mankind..."

Gumilevsky said in the preface that foreigners freely appropriated the Russian discoveries, that the Italians attributed the invention of the radio to Marconi, the Americans praise Edison, without mentioning the first incandescent lamp to A.N. Lodyga, "and even now, electric welding, invented by Russian engineers, is considered as an unnamed achievement of American technology ..."

He wrote:

"Hushing up the priority of Russian inventions and discoveries, the foreigners did not meet with a due rebuff from the circles of old Russia, servile before them. This is how a false legend was created about the backwardness and lack of independence of Russian engineering and technical thought. How much such an idea of Russian engineering contradicts reality, the reader will see from the very first pages of this book"...

However, an attentive **modern** reader from the very first pages of the book - starting with the preface by I.P. Bardina - can also see how contrary to reality is the long-established idea that in the USSR it was impossible to publish Stalin in three lines so that Stalin would not be glorified in one. Thus, in Bardin's preface, the presence of Stalin's name was limited to

a mention in the above



given quote of the tasks of the fourth *Stalinist* five

tap holes.

In Gumilevsky's own preface, Stalin was also mentioned only once. And even then, indirectly: when Gumilevsky wrote that in his work on a book about Russian engineers he was especially "attracted by a huge amount of material about the special, unique national character of Russian creative thought," he very appropriately quoted a quote about the essence of national character from Stalin's classic Marxism and the National Question.

Stalin wrote it, by the way, in Vienna in January 1913. And further, in

the text of the book, even when it was about the Soviet period, there were no glorifications of Stalin from Gumilevsky ... He wrote about the inventor of arc welding Benardos, about the teacher of Mendeleev, Beketov, Menshutkin Voskresensky - "the grandfather of Russian chemistry" and about Mendeleev himself, about the shipbuilder Krylov and the author of the Shabolovskaya radio and later the TV tower Shukhov, about the self-taught Kulibin and the scientist-bridge builder Zhuravsky, about the Soviet designer of aircraft engines Mikulin, the builder of the Georgian Military Highway Statkovsky and about many others - in total, the book tells about the activities of 96 Russian scientists -

"applied workers" and engineers...

But the author of the book "Russian Engineers" did not allow any praises to Stalin - the great leader of Soviet engineers. And this substantively proved that people engaged in a necessary and concrete business, people *of business* in the USSR had no need to praise Stalin. It was talkers, in order to hide their nothingness, they had to smoke the "leader" incense,

look for "enthusiastic" epithets, etc.

Stalin did not need this - after all, he himself was a man of action. The absence of his name is already

in the author's preface it was all the more revealing that Stalin took the most direct part in the fate of Gumilevsky's book... But not only Stalin...

And HERE lies the most juicy - for today's "democrats" - detail from the prehistory of the book by Lev Gumilevsky. On January 2, 1946, her manuscript was recommended to Stalin by none other than Academician P.L. Kapitsa. In his next letter to Stalin, he certified the book in the following terms:

"Comrade Stalin, I think that I am doing the right thing in drawing your attention to the enclosed book by Gumilevsky "Russian Engineers" ...

... It turned out ... an interesting and fascinating book. What is interesting in this book is that, in addition to the picture of the achievements of individual people, a general picture of the development of our advanced technology is obtained, as it were, for many centuries.

Apparently, we have little idea of what a great storehouse of creative talent has always been in our engineering thought... From the book it is

CLEAR: 1. A

large number of major engineering initiatives were born in our country. 2. We ourselves

almost never knew how (more precisely, tsarism did not give. - S.K.) to develop them (except in the field of construction).

3. Often the reason for not using innovation is that we usually (more precisely, the tsarist administration, which was shown by L. Gumilevsky. - S.K.) underestimated their and overestimated foreign ...

After all, excessive modesty is an even greater disadvantage than excessive self-confidence. In order to consolidate the trouble (in the Great Patriotic War. - S. K.) and raise our cultural influence abroad, it is necessary to realize our creations.

cal forces and opportunities ... "

Pyotr Leonidovich Kapitsa is difficult to write down among the active Russian patriots. Judging by the frankly cosmopolitan position of his "television" son, Professor Sergei Kapitsa, it is unlikely that there was a special cult of Russia in the house of his academic father ... And the reasons that prompted the elder Kapitsa to recommend the manuscript of Gumilevsky's book to Stalin,

not clear to me personally...

Perhaps Kapitsa in this original way insured himself against the troubles already approaching him, or perhaps the really natural pride in Russia and its talents played a role - I don't know ... But Pyotr Leonidovich assessed the situation very accurately and patriotically:

"... It is clearly felt that now we must intensify our own original technique. We must do our own way, and the atomic bomb, and the jet engine, and oxygen intensification, and much more. We will be able to do this successfully only [when] we believe [in] the talent of our engineer and scientist and

respect [him], and when we finally understand that the creative potential of our people is not less, but even more than others, and we can safely use it polo

live.

That this is so seems to be proved by the fact that in all these centuries no one has been able to swallow us up. <...>

We really need such and similar books, it would be nice if this was said by the press department of the Central Committee.

*Your P. Kapitsa ... "*

As for Stalin himself, Kapitsa was here rushing through the open gates. If he had read more carefully both the works of Lenin and the works of Stalin himself, he would have known that both great leaders of the new Russia—in contrast to the mass of mediocre "leaders" of old Russia—always believed in the talent of Russian engineers and scientists and always knew and convinced others that the creative potential of our people is not less, but even greater than others...

But as for the "intellectuals" and semi-intellectuals from among Manek and Vanek, Kapitsa was absolutely right here ... Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov, a traitor twice to both the Russian and his native Chechen people, who sold himself to the Nazis at first during the war, and after the war - the Yankees, once gave birth to a kind of almost aphorism: "Stalin made two mistakes: he showed Ivan Europe and showed Ivan Europe" ... However, Abdurakhmanov, as always, just stupidly slandered the Russian people, Russia and

Stalin . Uncritically, "European gloss and chic" was perceived, having come to Europe, not by Ivan, but *by Vanka ...*

Alas, there were always enough such *vaneks* in *Rasey* on all floors of the social "ladder". And "acquaintance" with "Europeans" only increased the amount of saliva flowing from their open mouths. And in the memo of the press department of the Personnel Department of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks dated February 7, 1948, one could read, for example, the following:

"The critic Boyadzhiev, regarding the production of the play by M. Aliger "The Tale of Truth", stated that only persons who are at a low level of cultural development can endure the suffering that Zoya Kosmo Demyanskaya endured. Cultural people are characterized by fear of suffering, and they do not go towards it (? - S.K.). Real (? - S.K.) Europeans see in Zoya a savage, an insensitive animal. The same Boyadzhiev cynically told the playwright B. Romashov over a glass of vodka that he should go to England, only there they would be able to appreciate the talent ... "

Excellent, for her age, by the best European standards, an educated, young Zoya Kosmo Demyanskaya went towards not suffering and fear, but towards the invaders who came to her native Russian land. At the age of eighteen, this girl filled in the ranks of fighters that empty place that was created in him by the "critic" Grigory Boyadzhiev, who was 32 years old in 1941, and others like him, who "defended" Russia in Tashkent ... Zoya got in line. And she died. And already another "critic" from the "Tashkent"

breed, Iosif Yuzovsky, who in 1941 was 39 years old, wrote about her feat, sung by Margaret toy Aliger: "This lyric of sacrifice is very far from the romanticism that we are looking for. ..."

Let us return, however, to Gumilevsky's book... In his letter to Stalin, Kapitsa noted as a shortcoming of the book that it "omitted such extremely prominent electrical engineers as Popov (radio), Yablochkov (voltaic arc), Lodygin (I am incandescent kidney), Dolivo-Dobrovolsky (alternating current) and others...".

Gumilevsky took Kapitsa's remarks into account when preparing the book for publication. But it did not linger, because soon Stalin answered Kapitsa like this:

"Tov. Kapitsa!

I have received all your letters. There is a lot of instructive information in the letters... As for L. Gumilevsky's book "Russian Engineers", it is very interesting and will be published soon ...

*I. Stalin»*

As already mentioned, the first edition of Russian Engineers was published in 1947. The second was in 1953, the year of Stalin's death. And more this book in Russia was not reprinted. But she was magnificent both in material and in the manner of its presentation. In any case, knowing much of what Lev Gumilevsky wrote about, I read it in one gulp.

The fact that the Khrushchevites did not reprint the book and that the Brezhnevites forgot about it is understandable. However, it is also interesting that although the author of "Russian Engineers" was not a beginner in literature, in order for his book to reach the Soviet youth, even in Stalin's USSR, a recommendation from Stalin himself was needed. A fact that speaks volumes... After all, the critic Boyadzhiev was not the only one who saw happiness in post-war Moscow beyond the London mists. Only those

who were indifferent to the past, the present, and the future of Russia could not fight this. It was not only Stalin and Zhdanov who understood the need for active opposition to the "Yuziks" of all sorts, why what was later called the "struggle against cosmopolitanism" was perceived by the healthy part of Soviet society, respectively, that is, with understanding and approval.

Moreover, as we can see, one of the original

Impulses for the next improvement of domestic minds from the beginning of 1949 were given back in 1946 not by the "Agitprop of the Central Committee", but by a respected academician - which for the current "Russian" "researchers" cannot but look embarrassing. After all, Kapitsa in his letter to Stalin not

only drew his attention to the unreasonable admiration of many domestic semi-intellectuals for the West, but actually gave Stalin a number of ready-made conceptual and almost verbal "blocks", which the latter used, for example, speaking to the leaders of the Union Soviet writers on May 13, 1947. Stalin then said:

"There is a topic that is very important... If you take our average intelligentsia, scientific intelligentsia, professors... they have an unjustified admiration for foreign culture. Everyone... is accustomed to consider themselves in the position of eternal disciples... Why are we worse? What's the matter? It happens like this:

Lovek does a great job and he himself does not takes ... We must fight the spirit of self-destruction zheniya..."

By emphasizing that he had in mind the "average" intelligentsia, Stalin once again proved that he understood the situation correctly. Indeed, at a high academic level - and the same Kapitsa referred specifically to him - the history of domestic science and technology

they knew quite well why and understood the need for an active struggle against "crooking before the West." And the Kapitsa-Gumi initiative

Levskoy immediately received a continuation in the preparation and publication already by the forces of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR

two volumes "People of Russian Science: Essays on Outstanding Figures in Natural Science and Technology".

It was published in 1948 with a preface by S.I. Vavilov. By the way, this interesting edition was also reprinted only once again - in the form of an expanded four-volume edition in 1965 with a circulation of seven - in total then thousands of copies.

So, it turns out that not only the "tyrant" Joseph Stalin and his "faithful oprichnik" Andrey Zhdanov, but also Pyotr Kapitsa, who is fully recognized by the "democrats", were involved in the development of the concept of combating cosmopolitanism.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the mention of L.I. Gumilevsky and his book, not to mention the connection between Gumilevsky and Kapitsa, is completely absent in all "democratic" sources, which widely speculate on the theme of "Stalin's struggle against cosmopolitanism".

mom."

Arno Lustiger, historian Gennady Kostyrchenko, an apologist for Soviet Jewry, and Stalin and Cosmopolitanism... 1945-1953, a major collection of the International Fund for Democracy, keep quiet about the book Russian Engineers. And only Zhores Medvedev in his book "The Unknown Stalin" said through gritted teeth that the book by Lev Gumilevsky, "the manuscript of which was sent to Stalin by Kapitsa, was published in 1947. " But Medvedev immediately lied, declaring that this book was published in "the then popular series "Restoring Russian Priority" in various fields of science and technology"...

In fact, the book "Russian Engineers" was not serial, and such a series is unlikely to exist even then. worked.

And one more thing about Kapitsa, which characterizes both himself and, even to a greater extent, Stalin and his other "oprichnik" - Beria ...



Here are the lines from another letter from Kapitsa to Stalin dated December 8, 1946. It was written after Kapitsa was removed from the post of director of the Institute of Physical Problems of the USSR Academy of Sciences by Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR No. Kapitsa wrote to Stalin:

"..I have great respect for you and your key employees and I see no way to express more respect than to tell you what I think. I also believe that this is necessary for the purpose that unites us all - this is the good of the country. I certainly sympathize with the new directions in which you are building the state, I understand and appreciate all the difficulties that you meet on the new path. I believe that for me, as a scientist, the main way to contribute to your creative work to the best of my ability is to

help to find the best organizational forms for our science, and this can only be when the scientist is not afraid to say directly what he thinks, even

when it's bad stuff..."

This letter from Kapitsa to Stalin was extensive and somewhat "watery", although the academician wrote to the head of state... But the tone is interesting - Kapitsa takes a position towards Stalin and his "main collaborators" even a little patronizing. And this is generally characteristic of the relationship between Kapitsa and Stalin - the academician has always been distinguished by absolutely independent (and, it must be said, by no means always justified) behavior in relation to the a

sti. So, on November 25, 1945, he wrote to Stalin a huge letter about his views on how to solve the Atomic problem. Sharply (and unfairly) criticizing Beria, Kapitsa in a post-postscript me concluded:

“PPS I would like Comrade. Beria got acquainted with this letter, because it is not up to the nose, but useful criticism. I would tell him all this myself, but it is very troublesome to see him.”

As you can see, without being engaged in "denunciations", Pyotr Leonidovich, nevertheless, "tricked" Stalin on Beria. Although, in order to see the Chairman of the "Atomic" Special Committee, Beria, a member of the Special Committee, Kapitsa, had only to come to the meetings of this Special Committee.

As a "useful criticism" of Beria, Kapitsa in his letter to Stalin impudently (you can't pick another word here!) Also recommended that Beria, the then Deputy Chairman of the State Defense Committee, super-"ace" of organizational work, learn how to organize large projects by example. ... laying a "transoceanic" cable and developing the first turbine. Nevertheless, Beria, according to the later recollections of Kapitsa himself, after reading his

letter dated November 25, 1945, called the author of the letter and invited him to talk ...

Kapitsa, in his own words, replied: "I have nothing to talk about with you. If you want to talk to me, then come to the Institute..."

This is how they, the racist intellectuals, were really "afraid" of Beria. If they were afraid, they would not behave so freely with the second person in the state ...

But what about Beria? And Beria, having received such an "invitation", arrived. And he even brought a gift to Kapitsa - a richly inlaid Tula double stem.

Reading about this in the 1989 edition of Kapitsa's collection of letters, I involuntarily recalled how the late academician Lvov once publicly lamented that, having invited Vladimir the answer is "not pleasure" of presidential aides. How dare you make *such* proposals to *such* a person ?! Such, dear reader, are "pies"... They are also "gingerbread"... Stalin and his "main collaborators" were people of the state caliber. What remains to be understood is what

caliber of people are their current "successors"?

However, looking at how

they are building Russia's relations with the outside world, it will not be difficult to

answer the last question. Stalin, on the other hand, his relations with the outside world

built differently...

THE OUTSIDE WORLD and Stalin... Can we not mention this as well... In real time, during Stalin's lifetime, his *personal* influence on the life of the planet was constantly growing. Although not everyone understood this - at least in words. For example, George

Kennan, an American diplomat and political scientist who lived in the USSR for many years, did not understand either Russia or Stalin, but he wrote there is a lot about them - both in secret memorandums, and in popular periodicals, and in books.

In one of his books, he wrote that Stalin "at the age of 65 (that is, in 1944. - S.K.), who had been at the helm of the state for twenty years, was the most powerful, but little known ruler in the world "... Kennan, accustomed to the fact that in his "empire of good" even the soiled panties of Monica Lewinsky are the subject of national attention, meant that, as he lamented, Stalin's personal life remained a "secret" that was not even curious American reporters could figure it out. Kennan was mistaken in his assessments of Russia and Stalin "on a grand scale," he was also

mistaken in small things, declaring that only a few foreigners had "seen" Stalin. Moreover, Kennan himself refutes himself in his memoirs. For example, he describes the post-war situation, when a group of American congressmen wished to meet with Stalin, and Kennan, who was replacing the then Ambassador Harriman, accompanied them to the Kremlin. Before that, in

During their acquaintance with the Moscow metro, the congressmen were treated to a "glass of tea", and one of them, already sitting in a limousine, grumbled: "But who is this Stalin? I don't want to date him... What if I punch this old man in the

nose? I think, having found himself nose to nose with Stalin, this Yankee no longer "rattled". After all, even Churchill admitted in print that when Stalin entered, he wanted to get up and take his hands at his sides.

Is it worth it to be surprised! Churchill himself was an extraordinary man, "multi-layered", but his originality could not be compared with Stalin's. And Churchill, as a great man, no doubt, was able to understand this better than many others. Churchill's whole life was spent in the circle of the ruling elite of the developed countries of the West, and above all -

the elites of England and the USA, so Churchill had something to compare with and with whom. He already saw all the insignificance of even the outstanding representatives of his class against the backdrop of Stalin's calm genius. Moreover, Churchill, knowing in practice what it means to lead a country, and even during the war, could not but be aware that the range of tasks and problems facing Stalin was three or four times, or even more serious in comparison with the "military" duties of him, Churchill. By the way,

Stalin also stood out for the variety of tasks he successfully solved against the background of all the of contemporary world leaders, how our Peter stood out in his era against the background of European monarchs! However, the scale

and complexity of Stalin's tasks were as huge compared to the Petrovsky ones, as far as the Petrovsky guns were weaker than the artillery of the Red Army. However, the world-

historical significance of Stalin is not limited, of course, to his role in the Second World War. His significance was not reduced to this role in the first place then, during Stalin's lifetime, and is not reduced to this role today. Moreover, the significance of Stalin for the

past, present and future world is not just great. It is incomparable with the importance of any other historical figure in world history.

Stalin is hated even today by so many because he has become the largest - even larger than Lenin - a real **figure** in the world confrontation between Good and Evil. In this sense, Stalin has no equal either in the bygone 20th century, or, even more so, in the new 21st century, which is just beginning.

In his last public speech, which ended on October 14, 1952, the XIX Congress of the CPSU, Stalin

said:

“Earlier, the bourgeoisie allowed itself to be liberal, ... and thereby created popularity for itself among the people. Now not a trace of liberalism remains... The banner of bourgeois-democratic freedoms has been thrown overboard...

Previously, the bourgeoisie was considered the head of the nation, it defended the rights and independence of the nation ... Now the bourgeoisie is selling the rights and independence of the nation for dollars. The banner of national independence and national sovereignty has been thrown overboard...”

But who should raise the banner of civil liberties in the world? Answering this question and addressing both the congress delegates and foreign guests of the congress - members of the leadership of the communist and people's democratic parties of the world, Stalin said

hall:

“I think that you, the representatives of the communist and democratic parties, will have to raise this banner and carry it forward if you want to gather the majority of the people around you. There is no one else raise.”

And what about the banner of national sovereignty? Stalin answered this question:

“There is no doubt that this banner will have to raise it to you, representatives of the communist and democratic parties, and carry it forward if you want to be patriots

of your country if you want to become the leading force of the nation. There is no one else under it take..."

Stalin's last words, addressed to the whole world for the last time in his life, were: "Long live peace among peoples! Down with the warmongers!"

And that's what matters! In saying what he said on October 14, 1952 in Moscow, Stalin did not cross out the slogan "Proletarians of all countries, unite!". But here he was following Lenin, who, after October 1917, said: "Before October, we were defeated, after October we are defencists." And now Stalin was loudly

declaring that henceforth only communists could be true champions of human freedoms and true patriots in all countries. That if a communist claims national leadership in any country, he must be a defender of personal freedoms and a patriot.

But this also applied to Soviet Russia! It was impossible to lead Soviet Russia without being on the side of the freedoms of the people and without being a Soviet patriot. One cannot be Russian without a feeling of deep patriotism, which has nothing in common with nationalism and chauvinism. So is it possible to lead

Russia without being a communist? Not a parliamentary "member of the party", but a communist, a Bolshevik of the Leninist-Stalinist formation? After all, only such Russian people can ensure Russia's prosperity and future.

After the war, Stalin's Russia became an ever more attractive moral force in the world—and this was already frightening to the West. Stalin's

Russia - especially having acquired the Russian Nuclear Shield - turned out to be more and more formidable

strength and in the systemic global confrontation between Labor and Capital.

And it was even more terrible for the World Gold Elite... And at

the same time, Stalin's Russia became more and more the guarantor of freedoms and national sovereignty of all countries that looked at it with hope and faith. Would China, India, Indonesia have gained independence, say, in such a short time, if Stalin's Russia had not existed in the world? Would broad social gains in

the Western world and in the United States itself be possible if it were not for Stalin's Russia?

While Stalin was alive, he was terrifying to the forces of World Evil with his strength as a great leader of a great state opposing World Evil.

But even having descended into the grave, Stalin remained terrible to them as an unsurpassed moral symbol for all the truly thinking forces of the

Planet. Being at the head of a mighty state, he did not claim Russia's world domination at the expense of the force of arms, covering up unequal economic expansion. Stalin laid claim to Russia's

honest ideological leadership in the world as a guarantee of a future world order that would be just for all the peoples of the Earth. By this he is terrible to

the World Evil even today. After all, if Russia gains strength for a new revival, then it will be done under the banner of national freedom and national sovereignty, not only for Russia, but also for the rest of the "globalizing" countries of the world.

And this means that the world - if it does not want to turn into the "backyard" of the United States and the World Golden Elite, will sooner or later have to stand under the banner of Stalin!



Not only Russia, but the whole world - if it wants to be free! After all, even the bourgeois historian Arnold Toynbee in 1971, reflecting on the realities of capitalism, declared:

"I assume that humanity will agree to a harsh dictatorship of the Leninist type as a lesser evil than self-destruction or constant anarchy, which can only end in self-destruction."

Alas, the academic Anglo-Saxon Toynbee had a too good opinion of humanity - it was already in Toynbee's time that it was rapidly weaning itself from thinking and choosing, starting - as far as developed countries are concerned - to finally degenerate into an "electorate". In countries "developing" humanity began to move from a semi-animal to a semi-vegetative state, handing over its fate to Western "gardeners".

Toynbee, however, was both right in evaluating the prospects of the "Private Initiative" society and wrong in evaluating the essence of the ideas of Lenin and Stalin. After all, if Toynbee had at least carefully read *The Economic Problems of Socialism*, he could have understood that the fundamental tenet of Stalinist (and therefore Leninist) socialism was not a rigid dictatorship, but the task of such an economic and cultural **re-education** of society, when "labor, from a means of only maintaining life, will be turned **in the eyes of society** into the first vital need, and public property into an unshakable and inviolable basis for the existence of society" ... Not violence against the freedom of man, and the education of a

new, all-round free man—this is the vital and political credo of Lenin and Stalin.

As for the fact that in the future capitalism can only ensure self-destruction of humanity - here Toynbee was accurate in his forecast. We'll talk about this a little more. So, Stalin's Russia - as an alternative to global self-destruction - was terrible for the World Evil

- as the leading force for the destruction of man in man - by the very fact of its existence. A possible future Russia under the banner of Steel is even more terrible for the World Evil. After all, what happened ... In the past, under the banner of Lenin-Stalin, Russia, having huge natural

resources, a reserve of human strength and having received - in the words of Lenin - the wonderful scope that the great revolution gave to folk art,

created itself as a really powerful and abundant Rus'. If we recall again the words of Lenin, then we can say that Russia has become such, throwing away every despondency and every phrase, clenching her teeth, gathering all her strength, straining every nerve, every muscle ... Moving forward, she is under the banner of Lenin-Stalin was building a solid foundation of socialist society, stone by stone, and on this

foundation she created such a solid building that even war could not bring down. Stalin's Russia worked tirelessly on

the creation of discipline and self-discipline, organization, order, efficiency and harmonious

the labors of the forces of the people.

And so it came to power...

However, after Stalin, Russia was unable to retain this power and fell victim to the same anti-Russian forces that Stalin himself fell victim to, that is, a victim of external World Evil and its internal "fifth column", consisting of "partoplasm" and

"creative intelligentsia" with its hysterical outbursts... If Russia - in

its current form "Russian" and a conglomerate of "republics" "CIS" - continues to be idiotic, its future, like the future of the whole world, is deplorable. Its destiny - like the destiny of the whole world - is self-destruction. I didn't say it, it was the "great" Toynbee who said it almost forty years ago.

But if Russia takes up its mind, then it will inevitably again take advantage of Lenin's advice and, still having huge natural wealth and a reserve of human strength, will unite the peoples of the USSR around itself and set about recreating a new mighty and abundant Rus'.

It will once again cast aside every despondency and every phrase, once again clench its teeth and no longer be stone by stone (we have learned something), but in a matter of years it will gain new power, and then...

And then, firstly, the new Russia Ivanov and Mariy will no longer be afraid of any historical troubles, because she will win her last historical victory over her most serious enemy - the people of Vanek and Manek ..

But the Russia of Ivanov and Mari will win its decisive victory only when it does not destroy this "narodishko", but **re-educate** him - as Comrade Stalin bequeathed to us. After all, the Vankas and the Mankas are also ours ... They are, although *unlucky, dissolute*, but our own brothers. They are also Russian. Yes,

Russia Ivanov and Mariy is quite possible. But it is possible only under the banner of Stalin! After

all, the banner of Stalin is not a black banner of fear, but the Red banner of faith, hope, love and the struggle for a smart and cheerful life in Russia...

will become

the hope of the world and the leader of all the progressive forces of mankind who do not want to fall victim to the World Evil, that is, to self-destruct. Can such a prospect not terrify these same forces?

That is why they do not want to subdue Russia, but to destroy it. And in this

aspiration, they have their most important ally - the eternal racial stupidity ... It is not for nothing that it is said: "The shell of lawlessness

there is in the ocean of stupidity "...

Doesn't this mean that it's time for the Russian people to grow wiser?

The role of the RUSSIAN people in the creation of the Russian state has always been leading and decisive. But the role of the Russian people—especially its Great Russian and Ukrainian branches—turned out to be decisive in the destruction of the Russian state in 1991 as well. And, having begun to destroy their "Big Nest" in the 20th century, the Russians continued to destroy it in the 21st century. And they destroy it to this day... I feel a feeling close to

physical disgust for Madame Khakamada - she is so miraculously, inhumanly shameless, shameless in everything... But she, with reference, however, to her father, said I once had a thought that periodically interferes with me, like a nail in a boot that has come out. Comparing different peoples, Khakamada reasoned in the spirit that Japan is de-monolithic concrete, Europe is skillful brickwork, but Russia is a barrel of sand. And as soon as the "hoops" fettering Russia burst, it immediately crumbles.

Any catchy phrase is nothing more than a phrase. And in this "phrase" of Khakamada there are also many inaccuracies

steps, starting with the fact that even monolithic concrete gives cracks, and a reliably worked and correctly operated barrel will be durable for centuries. However, the "khakamad" image of Russia, although  
offensive to us, is not so — in some ways — wrong. Indeed, within Russia there has always been and still is not only the potential for creation and unification, but also the potential for death and decay.

I cannot—as much as I would like to—call Pyotr Leonidovich Kapitsa an impeccable patriot. But there was still a Russian vein in him, and he was born and lived in Russia. That is why he understood that "the creative potential of our people is not less, but even more than others, and one can safely rely on it." That is why he cited the fact that "for all ... centuries we have not been

who could not absorb ... ".

That is how it is, but here is another, in fact, documentary evidence of such a deeply Russian and deeply knowledgeable person as Leonid Pavlovich Sabaneev. In the late seventies of the 19th century, he, the famous hunter, wrote in the monograph "Wolf":

"Our peasants, due to a lack of entrepreneurial spirit, **and, moreover, deprived of experienced leaders** (emphasis mine. - S.K. ), are almost defenseless from wolves. In addition, our villagers are also distinguished by their extreme carelessness: an entire village, for example, entrusts its flock to a crippled or foolish shepherd or shepherd boy, who, of course, cannot serve as a reliable defense against the attack of predators. Meanwhile, in Germany,

the first news of the appearance of the predator

huge villages without exception take up arms and arrange a correct attack on him. With us, such persecution is a friendly rare exception.

A detail of the people's way of life... And it is also a sign of one's

destiny. Let us also recall the "table slice" described from nature by the ex-populist Engelhardt. After all, if you think about it, this is the symbol of the old, royal "Race" ...

Alas, in the Russian people, the traditions of disunity and divisions have existed for a long time, although they were certainly not characteristic of the Russian people initially - otherwise the Russians would not have spread throughout the Russian geopolitical wandering for a thousand years is so free, wide, simple and, in fact, bloodless.

However, the Mongol-Tatar yoke influenced the Russian national character in the most vile and tragic way... Mikhailo Vasilievich Lomo Nosov formulated correctly in 1748: "... how many what is taken away from one body, so much is added to another..." and added: "This universal natural law extends into the very rules of motion; for a body that moves another by its power loses as much of it in itself as it communicates to another, which receives movement from it.

Yes, this law is universal and "extends" into the rules not only mechanical, but also historical movement. Rus' covered the West and gave it the opportunity to develop. No matter how hushed up this truth is, it does not cease to be the truth. I do not want to say that the Russians defended the Europeans consciously - they just fought on their own land against foreigners for their own land. But

thus, Rus' weakened the pressure of the Wild Steppe so that only a few smoothed "waves" of that "typhoon" that hit Rus' reached Europe. As a result, the freedom of development, which was taken away by the steppes from Russia, was added to Europe. Having lost its freedom in the 13th century, Russia, as it were, handed it over to Europe - in full accordance with the law first formulated by Lomonosov, and only later by Lavoisier. Before the invasion of Rus' by the Wild Steppe, the daughter of the Kievan Russian sovereign Yaroslav the Wise, Anna Yaroslavna, brought with her through all the dark - then - Europe to the unsightly - then - Paris from the bright capital city of Kiev, the Russian Psalter. Anne, Queen of France, was literate. And her husband - the French king Henry - no.

And after the steppe "fire" went through Rus', the capital city of Kyiv lay in ruins. AND, recalling the words of the poet, we can say that it is not known which Russian Iliads and Odysseus, written on Russian birch bark, humanity has lost, because "the birch bark burns perfectly, even if

she's a genius word...

A wave of destruction born in the Wild Steppe, destroyed the first outstanding Russian achievements niya, slowed down Russian development and culture for centuries and distorted the Russian national character, creating in the former people Ivan da Mariy also the people of Vanek and Manek. We received Asiaticism as a result of the specific separation

of Russian lands after the death of Yaroslav. We got rid of Asiaticism like a yoke, having fallen under the banner of Moscow that unites the Russian land, the banner of centralization. But have we rid ourselves of Asiaticism as a spiritual heritage?

beyond the three black ages in which it lasted?

In his amazingly interesting work, The Chinese in the Ussuri Territory, one of the most active Russian patriots, Vladimir Klavdievich Arseniev, wrote bitter lines:

“... The Chinese do not live alone, but in groups of several people. Even where there are twenty or thirty of them, there are no quarrels or they are extremely rare. The next day after the quarrel, the same Chinese work together again, looking as if they were did not quarrel.

In this regard, Russian settlers are the exact opposite of the Chinese. Where three or four of them gather, quarrels begin the next day, and after that the deliberate destruction of each other's arable land begins. How many

Before my very eyes... artel enterprises collapsed only because their partners quarreled among themselves and did not carry things through to the end!”

Artel enterprises were collapsing before Arseniev's eyes... And before our eyes and with our stupid behavior, the great Soviet Union is collapsing (still collapsing!).

What a shame - Arseniev wrote about the Russian people sad, but - the truth. The truth that Russians, alas, often behave in such a way that they can be called a people of stupid individualists.

But Arseniev is also a deeply Russian person. century However, he was a staunch collectivist.

Actually, if among the Russian people there were not many of the same convinced, a born



ny collectivists - Ivanov and Mariy, then great Russia simply would not have taken place!

For a more accurate historical and current view of the position and prospects of Russia, it is useful, however, to cite two more quotations.

So:

"The fate of Russia, having died an iguanodon or a mammoth, is to turn into a weak and poor state, which is economically dependent on other countries ... Soul and heart are taken out, all ideals are broken. There is no future for Russia; we have no present and no future. There is nothing left to live but to feed and keep the family — there is nothing else. The final fall of Russia as a great and united power due to causes not external, but internal, not directly from enemies, but from its own shortcomings and vices and from the complete atrophy of the feeling of fatherland, homeland, common solidarity, the feeling of "holy union" - an episode having few analogies in world history... We are really fit only to become manure for peoples of higher culture..."

Well, let the reader try to guess - to where and who said it?

And when and by whom was it said:

"... The Russian people are a defeatist people; That is why such a monstrous phenomenon as the presence among purely Russian people is possible - people passionately desiring the final defeat of Russia. Defeat is always more a matter of concern to Russians than victory and triumph ... An unusually ugly phenomenon is the absence of Russian in general and, in particular, Great Russian

th patriotism. In the so-called Russian state, there are all sorts of patriotisms - Armenian, Georgian, Tatar, Ukrainian, Belorussian - their name is legion - there is not only all-Russian ... As if the Great Russians, who in their time created the now perishing Russia, are completely exhausted ..."

These are excerpts from the diary of the academician-historian, director of the Rumyantsev Museum, Yuri Vladimirovich Gauthier, dated ... July 1917.

History! Born in 1873, he died in 1943 as an academician of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the author of "generalizing," as it was said in the 1953 volume of the Encyclopedic Dictionary, "works on the history of the material culture of

Eastern Europe." Comments on his unfortunate forecasts of 1917, perhaps, are unnecessary, but I still remind you that these forecasts of a professional connoisseur of history and culture, forecasts that are so tragically relevant today, could well have come true even then, *in real time*, if...

If not for the presence of Lenin, Stalin and their associates in

Russia! And if it were not for the subsequent laborious state work for the glory of Russia, carried out in Russia by Stalin ... That,

in fact, is what you need to know, understand and everyone should remember before answering the question - whose name personifies thousand-year-old Russia? Of course, the

current crisis in Russia is our last crisis. Its tragic outcome, if Russia repeats idiotically: "All the way!", is not avoided. However, the final Russian tragedy is by no means programmed automatically. Yes,

provocations against Russia will only multiply, and the conflict in South Ossetia is another confirmation of this. It was created, of course, not in Tbilisi, but in Washington, and the "fifth" column of the West in Moscow played along with it. But, perhaps, it is symbolic that in the course of it, Russia - not in the person of the castrated "Rossiya", but in the person of Russian guys in field uniforms - came precisely to Stalin's homeland, to Gori. And there they were met not by curses, but by the hands of Georgian mothers, outstretched for help. Well, Stalin's Russia and Stalin's Georgia were united in Stalin's era.

And there are no objective reasons why this unity—under the banner of Stalin—could not become real again. Already forever.

In BELARUS, already in the 21st century, a memorial "Stalin's Line" was created. There is also a monument to Stalin. And people go to him. And they bring fresh flowers to Stalin ... And in the

"Rossiyanin" on August 18, 2008, the results of the new vote were posted on the Internet according to the new "rules" at the third stage of the "Name of Russia" project.

Bewildered by Stalin's first place, the organizers of the project, likening "Mr. Lieutenant" from the classic "White Sun of the Desert", declared that the project was going "in the wrong direction" and that Stalin's leadership was imaginary and explained by "hacker attacks and mass flashes -mobs"... At the same time, the organizers also use "lure" (an expression that disgusts me, but we use it almost officially) of the lowest rank - even though among the organizers of the project there is a seemingly solid academic institution.

However, the true level of this Institute of Russian History of the Russian Academy of Sciences is unlikely to have gone far today.

on the level of the mass of "Russians", who, as a kind of pass-admission to the "voting machine", are asked questions like: "Which region did Potemkin join Russia - Karelia, Kalmykia, Crimea or Chukotka?" Well, we must be glad that the Balearic Islands or Inner Mongolia have not yet been included in this list ... Anyway, a new round of voting began on August 14, 2008. And he

allegedly gave the following result: Alexander Nevsky, Sergius of Radonezh, and immediately after them - Vladimir Vysotsky ... If the first two names in Russian history are really high - although not in

the very first places, then the name of the hoarse "bard" The third national hero in the entire history of Russia is proved by only one thing - how rapidly the Russian national feeling is degrading in certain circles - circles either voting or counting.

In any case, Vysotsky, standing above Stalin, who was lowered to fourth place, is an insult not to the memory and not the name of Stalin - this is an insult to Russia. He was a good guy, but Vysotsky as a historical (!!!) person?

Well,

yes... However, if the remaining eight people from the first dozen "August" candidates took part in the voting and their votes turned out to be decisive, then it would be Stalin who would have taken his rightful first place!

Because for whom, if not for Stalin, would Mikhail Lomonosov, Yuri Gagarin, Vladimir Lenin, Georgy Zhukov and Konstantin Rokossovsky, Sergei Yesenin and Alexander Pushkin, who follow him, vote? .. And even

having a great soul, but, alas, chaotic mind, and Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky, who turned out to be thirteenth (wow!) on August 18, would not risk zero, perhaps, to go against their choice ...

Like the fourteenth candidate, Anton Ivanovich Denikin. The latter, however, until the end of his days never reconciled with Stalin's Russia and naively hoped that, having defeated Hitler, the Red Army would turn against Stalin ... But it is very likely that even Denikin, who died in 1947, would have paid tribute Stalin - if I could take a look at the entire course of the post-war history of Russia up to the moment the project "Name of Russia" began ... After all, what is significant and

interesting - even for the sake of laughter, no one even remotely remembered such an outstanding (I'm not joking - he went around in rating of Judas Mikhail Gorbachev and Judas Iscariot) a figure like Boris Yeltsin, not to mention the allegedly unprecedentedly popular Vladimir Putin and the new "hope" "Rossiyanin" President Medvedev ... Even Denikin "Russians",

it turns out, appreciate

higher...

Well, on business and honor...

It is also indicative that even the Internet generation "at point-blank range" do not see any "alloboric" "stars" and dimbilans there.

So, maybe our affairs are not so bad? Perhaps the Russians have retained at least some sense of

proportion ? Well, let's wait and

see... And I mean, of course, not the results of the "Name of Russia" project. They are these results, they can be any, despite the obviously correct answer to the project question. No, I mean the coming years of Russia's life, which will either finally bring us to the brink of a historical abyss, or lead us to the right road, on which Stalin and Lenin have been waiting for Russia for a long time. Will they take it out?

Well .. Let's  
wait  
and see.

THE ESSENCE OF THIS BOOK is clear from its title - this is a book about Russia and about the number one figure in Russian history, Joseph Stalin. Around his name, both during his life and after his death, there were and are disputes. And the fact that the current polls on the Internet over and over again give him (him, him!) Superiority, in itself proves the role and place of Stalin in the history of Russia and the

Much has been said and written about Stalin, but his "sworn friend" Winston Churchill said it best of all: "Stalin took Russia with a plow, and left it with an atomic bomb."

But the sovereign greatness of Stalin was also manifested in the fact that he saw the new Russia not only powerful, but intellectually and spiritually developed, free, having a five-hour working day and the best education system in the world. Moreover, Stalin was not just a genius. He was a here-and-now genius—a genius who creates the present and the future in real time. Stalin, like no one else, glorified Russia, and it is not his fault that

his descendants mediocrely squander his great legacy. I have long wanted to write my book about Stalin, but it turned out that I had to write it

on a very specific occasion, in connection with a loud, public, nationwide raising of the question: "Whose is it - " Name of Russia "?..". And I wrote this book in order to convince Russia that it was Stalin who turned out to be figure No. 1 in the history of Russia,

continuing the work of the second figure No. 1 in the history of Russia - Lenin ... That Stalin's accomplishments give him primacy even before Lenin.

For those who are subject to the "Admiral Nelson Syndrome", who, at undesirable moments for him, applied a telescope to a broken one, blind eye and claimed to see nothing, this book is unlikely to be of any use. They, like

Illustrated Oxford Encyclopedia, *they know* that Stalin was a "tyrant" and does not deserve a good memory of himself - not to mention not only the first, but at least some honorable place in Russian history. However, this book is not written for

the suffering.

incurable "nelsonism" ...

As for the organizers of the "Name of Russia" project, they are now, as I understand it, not happy with their undertaking. After all, if it is carried through to the end, then you look - in spite of all the tricks, Stalin will be the first. And then what? But,

perhaps, electronic "games" will put someone else in the first place. Let's say Khakamada... And why not? Isn't she in the first dozen? Well, it can be arranged - at least in December! After all, the current "Rossiania" has become adept at both electronic fraud and electronic manipulation.

nii "electorate".

And perhaps, fearing an undesirable outcome, the project "Name of Russia" will be slowly "put on the brakes." But is that the point! In any case, Stalin was, is and will remain irremovably the first person in Russian history. And with a deeply

creative and humanistic face

skim.

In the GEORGIAN newspaper "Iveria" in the issue of December 25, 1895, a poem was published 16-summer seminarian from the Tiflis Theological Seminary Soco Dzhugashvili. It is published today in various translations, often without the identity of the author of the translation. Only for the last reason I cite this poem by Stalin, also without indicating the translator, but with gratitude to him for his work.

As for the poem itself, here it is:

"He went from house to house,  
Knocking at strange doors,  
With an old oak panduri, With his  
simple song.

And in his song, and in the  
song, Like a sunny brilliance, pure,  
Sounded the great truth,  
Sublime dream.

Hearts, turned into stone, He managed  
to make them beat, For  
many, he woke up the mind,  
Dozing in deep darkness.

But instead of greatness and  
glory, the People  
of his land To the outcast  
poison In the bowl presented.

They told him "Damned, Drink,  
drain to the bottom ...  
And your song is alien to us,  
And your truth is not needed! .."

So does Russia need the truth of Stalin and the truth  
about

Stalin? I'm

convinced yes! Stalin told Alexandra Mikhailovna  
Kollontai that a lot of rubbish would be put on his grave.  
And now on it this garbage - nowhere else. However,  
the winds of history not only puff up the sails of those  
who know how to sail in a stormy sea, but also sweep  
away from the veils of history all the rubbish that has  
accumulated over the years of

timelessness and the abomination of desolation.  
Abomination gives birth to abomination, and the "leading  
pen" of MK, Alexander Minkin, declares: "Lenin and  
Stalin destroyed the agriculture of Russia ... And now  
industrial Germany (after I don't know what) more than  
half is bought abroad"...



The hint is transparent - Stalin, they say, was something worse for Russia than Hitler ... But does the main "gold collector" of MK really not know after what, after what actions of his own and others did Russia begin to buy food in such a massive way ? Moreover, it is bought not by boundless - from the island of Ezel to Cape Dezhnev and from the Arctic to Kushka - Russia, but castrated, not without the moral assistance of the Minkins, "Rossiyania" ...

Actually, the answer to Minkin can be found at least in the AiF publication. It is full of dubious arguments and distorted facts, but sometimes it tells the truth. And here is the "leading pen" of AiF, Vyacheslav Kostikov, complaining: "Food shortages have been growing in the world for several years ... It would seem that we should renew the abandoned arable land (over the past 20 years we have derelict 13 million hectares of farmland) ..." Stop, stop! How

are the Alexander Minkins with arithmetic and knowledge of history?

2008 - 20 years = 1988. Lenin

died in 1924... Stalin died in

1953... And Russian

agriculture began to fall into a state of vile desolation 20 years ago. It was not I who said it, it was Vyacheslav Kostikov who wrote it.

So who has destroyed and is destroying the agriculture of Russia?

Kostikov declares: "No, they only realized

today, when in some places they brought them to coupons for bread "...

But Stalin abolished ration cards as early as 1947. So who brought Russia

to new cards? And oh, did Russia catch on, as

Kostikov assures us? Russia can begin to emerge from the crisis

only once again under the banner of Stalin! But does it understand

Kostikov, does he agree with this? I don't think so... After all, he publishes his reasoning about the "Name of Russia" project — "What the Elite Cackles About," with the following subtitle: "Love for Stalin is all the people's slap in the face of politicians." The word "love" Kostikov emphatically puts in quotation

marks, and this hint is also transparent - not in Stalin, they say, it's a matter. Not Stalin, they say, the people love, but

"elite" despises and hates. Well, the

"Russian", "Allopugachev" "elite" is worthy only of contempt and disgust. But the people - the people of Ivan and Marya

- fell in love with Stalin during his lifetime. And all these years did not deprive him of his truly popular love.

Without any quotes! And

today, the truth that is needed for Russia to be able to finally sweep away the garbage and dirt from the grave of the most outstanding son in its history is breaking through to the new generations of the peoples of Russia...

Perhaps the Name of Russia project will be put on the brakes or its results will be falsified... Perhaps! But the word is not a sparrow, flew out - you

won't catch it, especially on the Internet. Question: "Who is the first figure in Russian history?" placed before society.

And Russia willy-nilly answer it

I have to - not in Internet contests, but in my thoughts and feelings...

And, FINALLY, one last thing... Joseph Stiglitz, the 2001 Nobel Laureate in Economics, reports in his book Globalization: Disturbing Trends that the lobby of the gigantic World Bank building on 19th Street in Washington DC is adorned with the slogan: "Our Purpose a world without poverty.

However, Stiglitz did not explain that in full this slogan should have looked like this: "Our goal is a world without poverty *for some*"... And this clarification

would mean only material poverty (more precisely, its absence). As for spiritual wealth or poverty, are the hereditary, hereditary *beggars of spirits* capable of setting themselves the task of creating a world devoid of spiritual poverty? After all, such a world cannot be created only for the chosen

nyh. It is possible only for everyone!

Or rather, for all those who not only live only by their own labor, not appropriating a single gram of someone else's labor, but also brought up in such a way that labor, from a means of only maintaining life, has already been turned in their eyes into the first vital **need**.

If society consists of such people, then in the eyes of society as a whole, the measure of success in life will be success not on the stock exchange, but success in labor for the good of society. A society whose good will be inconceivable without the good for every working and industrious individual. In the meantime... While in the United

States, as

well as ten years ago, and twenty years ago, millions of people die of hunger every year. No, I didn't make a reservation - it's in the USA, it's precisely in the United States that millions are dying ...

But here an explanation is needed... In fact, almost the entire today's world, heavily globalized in the US style, has become a kind of "backyard" of the West and the United States. But since the backyard is also included in the general household, its statistics must also be included in the total.

And the result is this ... Already in 1987, one of the leading experts in the field of human rights, the Norwegian scientist Asbjørn Eide, cited the following data from UNICEF - the United Nations Children's Fund: there are more than

1 billion people are constantly hungry, from 13 to 18 million people die every year from hunger and malnutrition; every 24 hours, 35,000 people die as a result of direct or indirect effects of malnutrition and hunger; 24 people every minute, and 18 of them are children under 5 years old. Professor Igor Pavlovich Blishchenko, one of the three "socialist" members of the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Affairs, established in 1983 outside the UN, but soon recognized by the UN as a representative body of twenty-nine international experts, in the preface to the report of this Commission from 1985 wrote:

"In terms of the number of victims, no other disaster can be compared with famine. In the period 1983-1985 alone, more people died of starvation than died during the First and Second World Wars, combined taken."

At the same time, the report of the Commission recognized that the cause of famine and death is not natural disasters but something else:

"Famine leads to serious changes in the balance of economic power within society. The poor get poorer, and the rich get richer... ..Hunger often forces African pastoralists to sell their livestock to someone else's buyers. When the poor, in order to survive, sell their property for nothing, someone gets rich on this ... "

This is the truth of the "backyard" of the "globalized" world... Yes, a "Russian" planted on the "needle" of the Ostankino Tower may not believe in it...

But then, most likely, the hour will come when he himself will find himself in the position of the distressed African pastoralists .

As for the Stieglitz world "without poverty", Joseph Stieglitz himself admits that if in 1990 2,718 million people lived in the world on less than \$ 2 a day, then in 1998 their number exceeded 2,800 million people. So, in eight years in the world "globalized" by the West, the number of

extremely poor (materially poor) people has increased by 80 million - by 10 million per year. And the pace of absolute material impoverishment of mankind is increasing, yielding only to the pace

of its spiritual impoverishment.

The Italian journalist Giulietto Chiesa wrote a book a few years ago called "Farewell, Russia!". I'll say: "Ay, Russia?.. Where are you?.. What

is your name ?.." Yes, what is your name, what is your name,

Russia? Will you understand that your name is

STALIN! That only this name can be a pass for you

who is not in a terrible, but in a cheerful and smart future ...

In 2002, the "globalist" I mentioned earlier, Joseph Stieglitz, placidly admitted that the International Monetary Fund directly supported privatization in Russia through corrupt collateral auctions "because corruption contributed to the good cause of Yeltsin's re-election." Die - you can't say it better! But is it only about corruption? In the current Yeltsinoid

"Rossiyanin", we are all now

being made accomplices in the nationwide waste of national wealth, unprecedented in the history of the world.

Let us imagine a bank whose managers not only decided to appropriate its assets, but in order for the embezzlement to be discovered as later, they involved the entire staff of the bank in the business of

embezzlement ... This is the figurative expression of the current Russia - a society **of total** embezzlers.

We are producing less and less, and the number of "foreign cars"

is growing ... From what,

sorry, shisha? And from such that now grandfathers and grandmothers squander what belongs to their grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and fathers and mothers recklessly burn through

the property of  
their children.

That's what we live. Do we live? Moreover, the forces of World Evil are now turning the whole world, all of humanity into the same

squanderer... What's next? Well, I will answer this question taking into account what Arnold Toynbee wrote in 1971: if humanity continues to live according to the laws of the World Evil, and does not move on to life according to the laws of the World Good, if humanity continues to betray its own true lights, among which the name "STALIN" burns brightly, then his destiny

will become...

Well, then his destiny will be "self-destruction or permanent anarchy, which can only end in self-destruction..." It was not I who said the

last, but Toynbee. And I will say: "Ay, Russia!" Whose name are you?

*August 13, 2008,  
Kremlev*

**Sergei Kremlev**  
**NAME OF RUSSIA: STALIN**

Published in the author's edition

Art editor P. Volkov

Technical editor V. Kulagina

Computer layout I. Kondratyuk

Proofreader V. Avdeeva

LLC "Publishing House" Yauza".

. 109507, Moscow, Samarkand Boulevard, 15.

For correspondence: 127299, Moscow, st. Clara Zetkin, 18/5. Tel.: (495)  
745-58-23.

OOO Publishing House Eksmo  
127299, Moscow, st. Clara Zetkin, 18/5. Tel. 411-68-86, 956-39-21.  
Home page: [www.eksmo.ru](http://www.eksmo.ru) E-mail: [info@eksmo.ru](mailto:info@eksmo.ru)

Signed for publication on November  
16, 2008. Format 84x108 1/32. Garamond headset. Offset printing.  
Boom. type. Conv. oven I. 16.8. Circulation 4000  
copies. Zach. No. 3884.

Printed from electronic media of the publisher. OAO "Tver  
Polygraphic Plant". 170024, Tver, Lenin Ave., 5 E-mail (E-mail) - [sales@tverpk.ru](mailto:sales@tverpk.ru)